





# Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



Library of  
Dr. W. H. Green  
1903

BV 813 .W3 1844 v.1  
Wall, William  
The history of  
infant-baptism











THE HISTORY  
OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

WILLIAM WALL, M.A.

MR. WALL'S DEFINITIONS.

W. Henry Green

Philadelphia

January 30<sup>th</sup> 1851







# THE HISTORY OF INFANT-BAPTISM.

BY  
✓  
WILLIAM WALL, M.A.

VICAR OF SHOREHAM, KENT, AND OF MILTON NEXT GRAVESEND.

✓ TOGETHER WITH  
✓  
MR. GALE'S REFLECTIONS,  
✓ AND  
✓  
DR. WALL'S DEFENCE.

---

SECOND EDITION,  
BY THE REV. HENRY COTTON, D.C.L

LATE STUDENT OF CHRIST CHURCH.

---

IN FOUR VOLUMES.  
VOL. I.

---

OXFORD:  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCXLIV.

THE HISTORY  
OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

IN

SEVEN VOLUMES

BY JOHN HARRISON

OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

IN TWO VOLUMES

BY JOHN HARRISON

OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY

OF THE EAST-INDIA COMPANY



# ADVERTISEMENT

BY THE EDITOR.

---

IN offering to the public this edition of Dr. Wall's works on infant-baptism, accompanied by the treatise of his antagonist Mr. Gale, it appears desirable to premise some few observations respecting these two authors; especially such as may throw light upon the publications which are here reprinted.

Of Dr. WALL's personal history the materials are very scanty; and little pains appear to have been taken towards preserving them, at a period when such information could readily have been obtained.

No life of him is given in the *Biographia Britannica*. And the account which Mr. Chalmers has inserted in his more recent 'Biographical Dictionary,' is extremely barren of details, and in some few points incorrect.

He was born in the year 1645, or 1646; but what was the place of his nativity, at what school he was educated, or whether he ever became a member of either of our universities, does not appear to be known.

About the year 1676 he was presented to the living of Shoreham in Kent; a vicarage in the diocese of Rochester, in the gift of the dean and chapter of Westminster.

Here he resided, in the faithful discharge of his

pastoral duties, during the long space of fifty-three years. It is said that he once declined the offer of a second benefice (Chelsfield), of the value of three hundred pounds a year, from conscientious motives, although it was situate within three miles of Shoreham; but subsequently he accepted one, of about one fifth of that value, namely Milton near Gravesend, at the distance of twelve miles from his residence <sup>a</sup>.

In 1676, or 1677, he married Catharine, daughter of Edward Davenant, esq. by whom he had two sons, William and Thomas, both of whom became citizens of London, but died before their father: also two daughters, who died in their infancy; and a third, Catharine, married to Mr. Waring of Rochester, by whom he left sixteen grandchildren, eight sons and eight daughters.

After a long life, silently but honourably passed in professional studies, and the duties of his sacred calling, Dr. Wall expired, on the 13th of January, 1727<sup>7</sup>/<sub>8</sub>, at the age of 82. He lies buried in the north aisle of Shoreham church; and over his grave is a marble slab, with a brass plate bearing the following inscription: ‘Hic situm est corpus Wilhelmi Wall; ‘in quem ob scripta ab eo edita Academia Oxon. ‘gradum Doctoris in Theologia sponte contulit. ‘Qui decessit 13 die Januarii anno D. 1727, ætatis ‘suæ 82; postquam animarum populi hujus curam

<sup>a</sup> The duty of this parish was discharged by a curate, the Rev. Mr. Thomas; of whom his rector speaks in high terms, particularly ‘as helping him much in bringing the people to a ‘conformity in the office of baptism, and other things.’ (See *Atterbury’s Correspondence*, vol. iii. p. 365.)



‘ vicarius gesserat per annos 53. Item et populi sui  
 ‘ de Milton rector per annos fere 20.

‘ Prope autem jacet uxor ejus Catharina, filia  
 ‘ Edwardi Davenant generosi, quæ decesserat 10 die  
 ‘ Maii A.D. 1706, ætatis 48. Filius etiam Thomas,  
 ‘ civis Londinensis, qui obierat 30 die Januarii 1709,  
 ‘ ætat. 25. Duæ etiam filiæ infantulæ, Elizabetha et  
 ‘ Rebecca. Filius etiam Wilhelmus, civis Londinen-  
 ‘ sis, qui decessit 15 die Junii, anno D. 1725, ætat.  
 ‘ 46.’

This inscription was printed sixty-five years ago, in Thorpe’s ‘ Registrum Roffense ;’ and has been recently verified for me by the kindness of a reverend friend on the spot.

It appears from a passage in Dr. Wall’s first volume, that his thoughts were originally turned to a deep consideration of the question of infant-baptism, by the circumstance of the part of England where he resided containing a large number of baptists. After perusing the publications of their chief advocates, he was so satisfied of the insufficiency of the arguments put forth in defence of *adult-baptism* as the only true form ; and so moved by the hardy and unsupported assertions of Mr. Danvers ; that he determined to sift the whole question from the beginning ; to search in ancient authors, ‘ how the ‘ first Christians did practise in this matter ;’ and to give the result of his researches to the world.

At what period this resolution was first formed, we have no means of knowing ; but from the slow and cautious habit which seems to have been his characteristic, as well as from his own expression, that he ‘ had for some years made it his business to ‘ observe,’ &c. it may be presumed that he spent

*several* years in collecting his materials, before he ventured to submit them to the public eye.

The ‘History of Infant-baptism’ was first published in 1705, in two octavo volumes. It immediately attracted considerable notice; and obtained for its author most honourable testimonies of approbation. The clergy of the lower house assembled in Convocation passed a vote, ‘That the thanks of this house be given to Mr. Wall, for the *learned and excellent book* he hath lately written concerning infant-baptism.’ And bishop Atterbury hesitated not to affirm, that ‘it was a book for which the author deserved the thanks, not of the *English* clergy alone, but of *all Christian churches*.’

The attention of foreigners was directed to it, by a review contained in the periodical publication entitled, ‘Nouvelles de la république des Lettres,’ conducted by M. Jacques Bernard, at Amsterdam.

Of the spirit of that review Dr. Wall thus speaks : ‘Upon the whole, I take M. Bernard’s remarks on my book to be such as become a learned and also a civil and friendly writer. As for the difference of opinion concerning some points of less moment in religion, it will always happen.’

But objections having been made to a passage or two in the work, as conveying personal imputations; and farther consideration having induced the author to alter some and strengthen others of his arguments, he put forth in 1707 his *second edition*, ‘with large additions,’ in quarto; in the preface to which he defended himself at large against the insinuations which had been thrown out.

M. Bernard (‘Nouvelles,’ &c. 1708. p. 592) informs us, that Dr. Wall had published a small piece,



of 45 octavo pages, containing the alterations, additions, and corrections, which he made in his second edition. This little tract I have never met with. It is briefly mentioned by the author, in his ‘Defence,’ p. 110.

Previously to the appearance of his second edition, Dr. Wall, either at the suggestion of friends, or from his own feeling of the usefulness of such a tract, published a compendious abridgement of his larger work, in the form of a Dialogue between a supporter and an opponent of infant-baptism; in which he insists chiefly and almost exclusively on the arguments derived from *Scripture*, as best suited to the capacity and studies of unlearned readers.

The title of this piece is, ‘A Conference between two men that had doubts about Infant-baptism. By W. Wall, vicar of Shoreham in Kent.’ 12°, *London*, 1706; (containing 83 pages, price 4*d.* or 25*s.* per hundred). A *second edition* of this appeared in 1708, 12°. And we may judge of its extensive popularity, from the author’s remark to Mr. Gale, that upwards of four thousand copies had been circulated before his ‘Reflections’ were published (in 1711). A *sixth* edition of it was printed in 1795, for the society for promoting Christian knowledge: a *seventh*, for the same society, in 1801: and a *ninth* in 1809, for the same. On comparing this last with the first edition, I find it the same, word for word, but less carefully printed.

After a second edition of the History had appeared, the question of infant-baptism was taken up by several opponents; amongst whom Dr. Wall, in his ‘Defence,’ specifies Mr. Emlyn, Mr. Whiston, and

especially Mr. Gale; to whose 'Reflections' he at length felt himself called on to reply, not so much from any pertinence or cogency of the arguments, as from the vaunting style of his performance, and the high character which the author bore among those of his sect.

This reply, 'in vindication,' he says, 'partly of the cause and partly of himself,' he published in the year 1720, being then seventy-five years old, under the title of 'A Defence of the History of Infant-baptism, against the Reflections of Mr. Gale and others:' having previously holden a personal conference with his opponent, in the presence of Mr. Whiston and other friends, and having obtained more full and correct information concerning the present state and opinions of the English baptists, from a distinguished member of their communion, Mr. Joseph Stennet, of whom he makes honourable mention.

For the good service performed in this 'Defence,' Dr. Wall received from the university of Oxford the honour of a Doctor of Divinity's degree: which, it appears from the catalogue of graduates, was conferred on him by diploma, on the 31st of October, 1720.

The greater portion of the work is occupied in closely following and replying to the statements of Mr. Gale; whose *learning* he deems much overrated, and of whose *accuracy* he has but a mean opinion: sixty-four pages at the beginning are devoted to the observations of M. Bernard, Mr. Emlyn, and Mr. Whiston; and about twenty-five at the end, to a work of Mr. Davye of Leicester, who



had recently entered the field of controversy in behalf of adult-baptism <sup>b</sup>.

At the same time our author was preparing for the press a *third* edition of his History, with such alterations and additions, as his further reading and communication with learned men during the interval of thirteen years had suggested as desirable. And to the Defence he subjoined an Appendix, of twenty-five pages, containing the most material additions and alterations which would be found in the forthcoming edition; for the benefit of those persons who had been purchasers of the former ones.

In the same year, 1720, was completed, in two volumes octavo, the *third* edition of the History, ‘with large additions:’ from which, as having received the author’s last revision, and being published under his own inspection, the present one has been carefully prepared: with the addition of some short notes by the editor, designed as references or illustrations for the reader’s assistance, but leaving the main arguments and proofs exactly as they were delivered by the author.

It may be mentioned, that Dr. Wall’s History and Defence having become very scarce and much called for a few years ago, a reprint of them was undertaken by a London bookseller in the year 1819. But as one chief object in this speculation

<sup>b</sup> Dr. Wall seems fully persuaded, that the greater part of Mr. Gale’s book had been compiled, either by himself or others, a considerable time before its publication, and was not originally designed for an answer to *him* in particular: (See *Defence*, p. 106. 121.) and even asserts that the third letter was actually *published* ‘a good while before the rest, as a *specimen* of ‘what the book should be.’ (*Defence*, p. 118.)

was *profit*, so little care seems to have been bestowed on publishing the text *correctly*, that the impression is not deserving of further notice. It is in three octavo volumes.

Walchius, in his valuable ‘*Bibliotheca Theologica*, (5 tom. 8°. 1762, &c.) at vol. iii. p. 648, asserts that a *fourth* edition was published in 1731. Perhaps he was mistaken; as I can neither find such an edition, nor discover any other notice of it. He likewise acquaints us, that it was holden in so great estimation on the continent, that a *Latin* translation was published, by professor Schlosser, of Bremen, with observations and confirmations of the arguments, in two vols. quarto, in 1748 and 1753. I was most anxious to peruse this version, while the present edition was in course of preparation: but could not find it in any library, public or private, nor could I procure from the continent more than the *second* volume, which of course could not alone be made use of. It is clear that the translator had seen the *second* edition only. The notes of M. Schlosser are voluminous, and sometimes convey additional illustrations of importance: but much of them relates particularly to disputes on the subject of baptism, carried on by writers of his own time and country. For his main scope and design, he refers to a general Dissertation, prefixed to the *first* volume, which I had no opportunity of seeing.

It may here be noticed also, than an *abridgement* of the History was published in the *Dutch* language by Conradus Bremerus, (with the addition of five Dissertations,) at Amsterdam, in the year 1740; Bremerus having been induced to this step, by learning, on a perusal of Dr. Wall’s work, that the practice of

infant-baptism in the Christian Church could claim a much higher antiquity than he had previously supposed.

Besides the foregoing works on the subject of *baptism*, a few other pieces of Dr. Wall's have been given to the public. Among these are,

1. A little tract, or rather prospectus of a designed treatise, bearing the following title : ‘ Some new ‘ inquiries relating to the following curious subjects : ‘ viz.

‘ A threefold Motion of the Earth.  
 ‘ The Rectification of the Calendar.  
 ‘ The Flowing and Ebbing of the Sea.  
 ‘ The Nature of the Loadstone.  
 ‘ The Variation of the Compass.  
 ‘ The Cause of Sea-currents and Trade-winds.  
 ‘ The various Motions of all the Cœlestial Orbs.  
 ‘ The finding out the true place of the Moon :  
 ‘ And facilitating the discovery of the Longitude.  
 ‘ To which is added an Appendix, containing an  
 ‘ inquiry into the nature of Comets, and of the dis-  
 ‘ solution of the World by Fire. By William Wall,  
 ‘ author of the History of Infant-baptism. Most  
 ‘ humbly proposed, and offered to the consideration  
 ‘ of the learned and ingenious as subjects of further  
 ‘ contemplation and improvement. But in a more  
 ‘ particular manner to the honourable, the learned,  
 ‘ and ingenious Gentlemen of the Royal Society.’  
 London, (no date,) 4to.

This tract consists merely of pages 1–12. and 23, 24 ; beside a Dedication to George Prince of Wales, and an address to the Royal Society, both signed B. H. J. ; also a short address to the reader, without any signature. The author does not actually



produce all which his title had promised, but contents himself with observing, that upon the two subjects, of facilitating the discovery of the Longitude, and the manner of finding out the true place of the Moon, ‘ he has something to offer to the public ‘ hereafter.’

2. Nichols, in his (*Anecdotes of Bowyer, or) Literary Anecdotes*, vol. i. p. 114, states that in the year 1715, Bowyer printed a *Sermon* by Dr. Wall; which is not mentioned by Cooke, in his *Preacher’s Assistant*. He does not inform us either of the subject or the text: and I have not been able to meet with the Sermon itself.

About this period he devoted much time to the critical study of the Holy Scriptures; marking the various readings of the original texts, and comparing together the principal versions. The result of these studies he committed to paper, intending them for publication: but so great was his caution, or distrust of his own attainments, that he himself did not publish any portion, although he lived twelve or thirteen years after this time.

3. After his death, a friend, in whose hands his papers were placed, sent forth, in an octavo volume, ‘ Brief critical notes, especially on the various readings of the *New Testament* books; with ‘ a Preface concerning the texts cited herein from ‘ the *Old Testament*; as also concerning the use of ‘ the Septuagint translation. By Will. Wall, S.T.P.’ *London, 1730*. The anonymous editor assures his readers, that the author had designed these papers for the press, subject to the revision and judgment of himself and a learned friend: and that he found himself, on their perusal, fully justified in presenting

them to the world, almost in the precise state in which they had come into his hands.

The volume commences with a long and valuable preface; the opening sentence of which unfolds to us the pious feeling which led to the composition of these ‘Notes.’

‘Since I have grown old,’ says the author, ‘I have chosen to do what many pious clergymen have advised to be done by any Christian that has a near prospect of forsaking this world: viz. to leave off in great measure the reading of other books, and to spend the remainder of his time in reading (only, or at least chiefly) the Holy Scriptures themselves: and, if his time be prolonged, to read the whole of them over and over.’

From a note appended to the volume we learn the period of his life at which it was composed, and also the fact that it received mature revision: ‘SOLI DEO GLORIA. Septuagenarius scripsi. Octogenarius descripsi.’

The Annotations extend to all the books of the New Testament. Those on St. Paul’s Epistles (and the Acts) are in *chronological* order; a plan which he judged very useful towards the clearing up of difficulties, and declared ‘he thought it great pity that there was not an edition of them placed in that order.’ A work, which has recently been accomplished by Mr. Townshend.

4. After an interval of four years, the remainder of Dr. Wall’s labours in this department was published, probably by the same unknown friend, with the following title: ‘Critical Notes on the *Old Testament*; wherein the present Hebrew Text is explained, and in many places amended from the

‘ ancient versions, more particularly from that of  
 ‘ the LXXII. Drawn up in the order the several  
 ‘ books were written, or may most conveniently be  
 ‘ read. To which is prefixed a large introduction,  
 ‘ adjusting the authority of the Masoretic Bible, and  
 ‘ vindicating it from the objections of Mr. Whiston  
 ‘ and the author of the “ Grounds and Reasons  
 ‘ of the Christian Religion.” By the late learned  
 ‘ W. Wall, D.D. author of the History of Infant-  
 ‘ baptism. Now first published from his original  
 ‘ manuscript.’ 2 vols. 8°. *London, 1734.*

The *Introduction* is that which had been previously attached to the Notes on the *New Testament*; not indeed with due propriety, but because at that time it was not intended that those on the *Old Testament* should see the light: a determination which probably was changed by the favourable reception given to the former volume.

It has been handed down to us that Dr. Wall was warmly attached to bishop Atterbury, his diocesan<sup>c</sup>. It appears that he carried on a correspondence with that gifted Prelate, especially concerning the times in which the four Gospels were written. In ‘ Atterbury’s Epistolary Correspondence,’ &c., 8°. 1784, vol. iii. are three letters addressed to him by Wall, in the years 1721 and 1722; the former two on the above subject, the latter on finding out who was ‘ the ‘ brother’ spoken of by St. Paul at 2 Cor. viii. 18, 19, an inquiry to which his attention had been specially invited by the bishop. There are two letters of

<sup>c</sup> His daughter is reported to have declared, that his zeal was so intense in this direction, that in case of the bishop’s recall from exile, he would have lighted up all Whittlebury Forest at his own expense.



Atterbury in reply, expressing his high sense of the Doctor's worth and learning.

Besides the above, I am not aware of any thing having been published bearing our author's name.

That Dr. Wall enjoyed a high reputation, deservedly acquired by his works, is shewn, not only by the abovementioned honourable testimonies of the House of Convocation and the University of Oxford; but likewise by the publicly expressed opinions of many learned men, both Englishmen and foreigners; some of whom agreed with him in sentiment, while others entirely differed.—Among these, the following few may be perused with interest.

Mr. WHISTON,—who had published a treatise against Infant-baptism, and late in life declared himself a Baptist, and finally forsook the communion of the Church of England on Trinity Sunday, 1747;—Mr. Whiston, in a pamphlet entitled ‘ Friendly advice to the Baptists, (8°. 1748,) asserts, ‘ The body ‘ of these Baptists have in general a very fair character; and not only from Bishop Burnet,—but ‘ from *the greatest of their adversaries*, I mean the ‘ *very honest, learned, and pious Dr. Wall*: whose ‘ History of Infant-baptism (not as to the controversial part, but as to the facts therein contained) ‘ seems to me most accurately done; and may, I ‘ think, be depended on by the Baptists themselves. ‘ Now with this Dr. Wall I became particularly ‘ acquainted, soon after I had published my “ Primitive Infant-baptism revived,” and went twenty ‘ miles on foot to debate that matter with him. He ‘ afterwards came up to London, and had a conference with Mr. Gale, his learned antagonist, myself, ‘ and other Baptists, at my house: and appeared to

‘ me all along utterly unable to justify himself in  
 ‘ opposition to the evidence produced by us against  
 ‘ him. However, Dr. Wall gives the Baptists this  
 ‘ character,’ &c.

CROSBY, the historian of the English Baptists, though an opponent of his principles, styles him ‘ the ingenious Dr. Wall ;’ and pronounces his work to be ‘ an elaborate history.’

WATERLAND speaks of him as ‘ a learned and ‘ judicious writer :’ and frequently refers to his authority when treating of the subject of *baptism*.

BINGHAM, in his ‘ Antiquities of the Christian ‘ Church,’ book ix. chap. 4. sect. 5. on the subject of Baptism, gives a high character of this work.

WOTTON, in his ‘ Miscellaneous Discourses,’ vol. i. p. 103, when discussing the usefulness of Talmudic study to a Christian divine, writes as follows: ‘ The ‘ substance of the reasonings of learned men’ (viz. on the point of Infant-baptism having been derived from the manner of admitting proselytes among the Jews in our Lord’s time) ‘ has been with great ‘ judgment digested and published in our own language within these few years, by Mr. Wall, in his ‘ “ History of Infant-baptism.” That work of his, (as ‘ far as it goes, which is for the first four centuries ‘ after Christ,) is by much the most finished collection of testimonies from Christian writers that ‘ has been made upon that subject.’

With respect to the reputation which he maintained among *foreign* scholars, I have mentioned above some honourable testimonies to the worth of our author’s works; and will merely add here the character given to his History by Walchius: ‘ Historia ‘ est hæc opus quod auctoris singularem eruditionem



‘ atque industriam commendat : quodque ad dogma  
 ‘ de Baptismo infantum illustrandum ac confirman-  
 ‘ dum multa præbet adjumenta.’ *Bibl. Theol.* tom. v.  
 p. 401.

As for his general habits, they seem to have been studious, and domestic. In his family he had to sustain several trials; his wife having been taken from him more than twenty years before his own death, and four out of his five children having died before their father.

From some anecdotes communicated by his surviving daughter to a correspondent of the ‘ Gentleman’s Magazine,’ where they are printed (vol. i. for 1784, p. 434,) he appears to have been of rather a lively turn of mind, and sometimes disposed to indulge in sportive sallies of wit.

But, as was observed above, so little of the personal history of this conscientious divine and laborious scholar has been committed to writing; that having nothing to produce in an authentic and satisfactory shape, it is better to be silent on this head; and to rest his claim to the gratitude of posterity, on the result of his persevering exertions to vindicate and uphold the pure forms of worship adopted by our excellent Church.

Of his opponent, the details are more ample. Mr. John GALE, a man of high character for learning, especially among the Baptists, to which sect he belonged, and in whose communion he for some years acted as a minister, although (on Whiston’s<sup>c</sup> authority) he was never ordained a presbyter, was

<sup>c</sup> ‘ Friendly Advice to the Baptists,’ 8°. 1748. p. 13.

born on the 26th of May, 1680, in London, of which place his father was an eminent and worthy citizen. From some early proofs of capacity displayed by his son, the good man destined him to the ministry; and with that view spared no expense in giving him a liberal education. We are told that his early youth exhibited an uncommon application to study, and the improvement and adorning of his mind with literature; accompanied by a careful avoidance of every kind of vice.

Thus early prepared, he was sent to Leyden, to finish his studies, and qualify himself for the duties of his future profession.

Soon after his arrival at that university, being then seventeen years of age, he lost his mother: an event which determined him to return home, so soon as he should have finished his course of *philosophy*, the principal point of his study. This having been accomplished in less than two years, he received the degree of Master of Arts and Doctor of Philosophy; on which occasion a highly complimentary letter was dispatched to his father by his tutor.

His first publication took place at this period: it is said to have been a Thesis ‘*De Ente ejusque Conceptu*’; which he dedicated to his father and his two uncles, sir John and sir Joseph Wolf.

From Leyden Mr. Gale proceeded to Amsterdam, where he studied under the celebrated Limborch; and formed an acquaintance with M. Le Clerc, with whom he kept up a correspondence for many years.

After his return to England, we find him studying the ancient classics, and the Oriental languages, with assiduity. ‘He also,’ says the writer of his



*life* prefixed to his *Sermons*, ‘read over and considered the primitive writers of the Christian church : by which he contracted a just esteem for them, neither approving the conduct of those who slight them, nor that of others who rely too much upon their authority.’

Four years afterwards he was offered the degree of Doctor in Divinity by the university of Dort, on the condition of giving his assent to the articles of their synod ; but this offer, from motives of conscience, he declined.

Dr. Wall’s *History of Infant-Baptism* making its appearance in the year 1705, and being highly lauded, Mr. Gale prepared a reply—(it is said, before he was twenty-seven years old :) when subsequently published, this piece met with many eulogists, among whom were Dr. Whitby, Dr. Wotton, and Mr. Whiston, whose friendship, together with that of other eminent men, he enjoyed.

About the age of thirty-five he began to preach regularly with unwearied diligence; ‘resolving firmly to regard no man in the discharge of his duty.’ His style was easy and natural, his expressions strong and lively, his reasonings clear and convincing.—‘The grand principle which he endeavoured to root the deepest, and cultivate with the greatest care, in his own mind, as well as in the mind of his hearers, was that of *sincerity* : upon which he thought our happiness or misery in a future state will depend. He therefore considered that this would be of the highest importance, when many of the acquirements we here gain one above another, will fade and wither away. Which made him very humble, notwithstanding his great abilities.

‘This also disposed him to judge charitably of those who differed from his sentiments; and to be very diligent in his inquiries after truth. His embracing the doctrine of the *Trinity* was one effect of this: for he did not run into this belief from any prejudices of education, or bias put upon his mind in his youth; having been early introduced into the conversation of those who examined the several doctrines of the Christian revelation with the utmost freedom; amongst whom were some (foreigners as well as others) of the first rank for learning and abilities.’

Some time before his death, Mr. Gale had formed the design of publishing an *Exposition of the New Testament* in the form of Lectures; and had drawn up an *Introduction* opening his method, which seems to have included a *new translation* and a *paraphrase*, giving the interpretation of various and perhaps opposite expositors, leaving the student ‘to judge for himself with just liberty and *true* freedom of thought.’

His conversation was sweet, but not abundant: he preferred to say much in a few words. His manner was affable and courteous to all, particularly to the lower classes. He never overpowered the ignorant with his learning. He sympathized with the afflicted, and aided the distressed. ‘In fourteen years’ intimate converse with him,’ says his biographer, ‘I never knew him mastered by anger, or disturbed by any irregular passions.’

He had entertained several useful designs before his death: as, that of making the study of the *Oriental tongues* more easy; of giving a *translation of the Septuagint* agreeable to Dr. Grabe’s edition:

also, a history of the notion of *Original Sin*, tracing the opinion from its first rise, and shewing how little grounds there are for the supposition that God could be its author.

He wrote to his father, on the appearance of Dr. Wall's 'Defence' twelve [*lege* nine] years after his 'Reflections' had appeared, as follows: 'Dr. Wall 'has written a Defence of his History of Infant-baptism; in which he has treated me very roughly, 'and has endeavoured to enrage the clergy as well 'as our own people against me: beside which there 'appears not to be much in his book: however, I am 'preparing an answer, which,' &c.

But all these good intentions were frustrated by a slow fever, which carried him off in the forty-first year of his age, in the year 1721.

Such is the brief outline of Mr. Gale's life and pursuits, as extracted from a memoir prefixed to his *Sermons*, in 4 volumes 8°. published in 1726<sup>f</sup>.

Crosby, in his 'History of the English Baptists,' vol. iv. has abstracted the foregoing account, (only mistaking *Leyden* for *Dort*, as the university

<sup>f</sup> In a note to 'Atterbury's Correspondence,' vol. iii. p. 372, the editor states that an original portrait of Mr. Gale by Highmore, from which Vertue engraved the print prefixed to his *Sermons*, was then (1784) in possession of the Rev. Mr. Duncombe.

At page 538 of the same volume is given a letter, (reprinted from the 'British Journal' of April 27, 1723,) stating that Dr. Gale's widow, being left with a large and destitute family, had been enabled, by contributions raised among her friends, to 'set up a coffeehouse in Finch-lane, London: where her excellent character and exemplary conduct entitled her to the public encouragement and support.



which offered him the degree of Doctor of Divinity.)

Mr. Gale states, in the advertisement to his *Reflections*, that being originally written for the private perusal of a friend, they were not intended for publication: indeed that an answer to Dr. Wall was expected from an eminent Baptist minister, Mr. Joseph Stennett<sup>g</sup>; who had already published a treatise on the subject, was possessed of great learning, and had personally discussed the point with Dr. Wall. But on its being found that nothing was to be expected from that quarter, his friends urged him to the attempt, lest Dr. Wall's work, having already obtained a high degree of popularity, should be taken for unanswerable. The piece was *published* in 1711, although said to be *written* in 1705 and 1706, when only the *first* edition of Dr. Wall's *History* had appeared: and is justly charged by Dr. Wall with containing objections to passages which had been either altered or wholly expunged in a second edition, published four years before its appearance.

No reprint of the *Reflections* took place for upwards of a century: but the appearance of a new impression of Dr. Wall in 1819, 'induced an editor 'to think of sending Dr. Gale's book again to 'press.' The new impression came out in octavo at London, in 1820. The editor has omitted the larger quotations in learned languages which were given at length in the notes to the preceding one: and has added, of his own, 'A Review of the

<sup>g</sup> His works, consisting of the *Answer to Russen*, *Sermons*, and *Poems*, with some account of his life, were published in five vols. 8°. *London*, 1732.

‘ Authorities for the Existence of Jewish Proselyte ‘ Baptism,’ directed against Dr. Wall’s Introduction. As this piece did not belong to either of our authors, and concerns itself with a much more modern state of the question, no notice is taken of it here ; and I have, in this instance, as before, printed from the original edition, published under the author’s own superintendence ; merely adding a few illustrative notes, as in the other volumes.

We have seen above the various pieces which Mr. Gale had *designed* : I am not aware that any were actually published, at least with his name, besides four volumes of Sermons. In these, as might be expected, he frequently discusses the subject of *baptism*, with allusions to the controversy. As in vol. ii. Sermon V. by the instance of our Saviour’s baptism he defends the custom of *dipping*, and evidently alludes to Dr. Wall’s preference of that mode above *sprinkling*.

In Sermon VI. p. 159, he repeats his argument from Matthew xxviii. that all who are to be baptized are first to be *taught*. He alludes to his own sense of μαθητεύω, *to teach*, although some men ‘ of great ‘ learning and reputation’ interpret it *to disciple*. P. 169, he briefly sums up the arguments used by Dr. Wall and others in defence of Infant-baptism. P. 170, he asserts, that among the Jews pots and cups, &c. were baptized. P. 174, abuses the Jewish rabbis as fools and blasphemers. This whole discourse is very strong in defence of *adult-baptism*.

In Sermon VII. he argues against those who undervalue *all baptism*.

In the eighth, he states the ‘ scheme’ of such as deny baptism : and argues against the Jews’ and the

Talmud's assertion, that the practice existed in our Saviour's time, and that he derived it from the Jews: or that this original of baptism can be any good foundation for the baptizing of *infants*.

In the next three Sermons, the same argument is followed up; baptism is maintained to be indispensable; and that there is no baptism but that of *adults*, and by *immersion*.

I have stated above, that Mr. Gale enjoyed a considerable reputation as a scholar, and was on terms of intimacy with learned men, both in England and on the Continent.

Among the latter class was Mr. Le CLERC, whose acquaintance he assiduously studied, and to whom on several grounds he seems to have looked up with much respect.

Of *our own* countrymen, Dr. WHITBY, who indeed had been frequently eulogized by him, is disposed to think and speak highly of his attainments. In the preface to his 'Answer to Edwards,' (8°. 1712,) he calls Gale a 'very learned antipædobaptist:' and in that to his treatise, 'Dissertatio de S. Scripturarum 'interpretatione secundum Patrum commentarios,' (8°. 1714,) he speaks of the 'Reflections' as 'literæ 'ad invidiam doctæ;' and asserts that the author has demonstrated the point of infant-baptism in the primitive ages of the Church to be a dubious and unsettled one.

CROSBY, as I observed above, repeats the account of his life and works given by the editor of his Sermons.

Dr. WOTTON is sometimes adduced as speaking in high terms of his performance. But if any person will take the trouble of reading over the eighth



chapter of Dr. Wotton's first volume of his 'Miscellaneous Discourses,' he will be able to judge how far this writer concedes to him that degree of merit which his biographers would claim on such authority.

WHISTON, as holding (late in life) similar sentiments on the subject of baptism, writing on the same question, and being personally acquainted with him, is led to speak of his performance and acquirements, which he does in terms of high praise :

' —The most learned Baptist you ever had, Mr. John Gale.'

' —Mr. Gale, their most eminent defender.'

' —The learned Mr. Gale, who was so very hearty and indefatigable in forming and supporting our "Society for promoting Primitive Christianity," in which he was our chairman for a considerable time.'

' I once heard their *most learned vindicator*, Mr. Gale, who was never ordained so much as a presbyter, put up such public prayers, as well as preach, in a congregation of baptists in London, many years ago.' *Friendly Advice to the Baptists*. 8°. Stamford, 1748.

It only remains to add, that with a view of rendering this edition deserving of public attention, all the quotations, both from ancient and modern authors, have been carefully examined and verified; and their several passages referred to with more minute exactness, agreeably to the latest and best editions: a task of urgent necessity, since the errors which had crept in were very numerous and often remarkable;—but one of much tedious labour, for which no return appears upon the page.

xxvi ADVERTISEMENT BY THE EDITOR.

I regret however to say that some few instances still remain unexamined: where either I was unable to meet with the work in question—as for instance, that of Mr. Davye—or the particular edition which had been used, and which perhaps contained some peculiarity of reading.

Whatever has been *added* in the shape of notes is enclosed within brackets, for the sake of distinction: in order that the *authors* may not inadvertently be made responsible for any errors into which the *editor* has fallen.

HENRY COTTON.

CASHEL, IRELAND,  
October, 1835.

## THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

---

FORASMUCH as the commission given by our Saviour to his disciples, in the time of his mortal life, to baptize in the country of Judæa, is not at all set down in Scripture; only it is said, that they baptized<sup>a</sup> a great many: and the enlargement of that commission given them afterwards, Matth. xxviii. 19, to perform the same office among all the heathen nations, is set down in such brief words, that there is no particular direction given what they were to do in reference to the children of those that received the faith: and among all the persons that are recorded as baptized by the apostles, there is no express mention of any *infant*; nor is there, on the other side, any account of any *Christian's* child, whose baptism was put off till he was grown up, or who was baptized at man's age: (for all the persons that are mentioned in Scripture to have been baptized, were the children of heathens, or else of Jews, who did not believe in Christ at that time when those their children were born :) and since the proofs drawn by consequences from some places of Scripture, for any one side of this question, are not so plain as to hinder the arguments drawn from other places for the other side, from seeming still considerable to those that have no help from the history of the Scripture-times for the better understanding of the rules of Scripture: it is no wonder that the readers

<sup>a</sup> John iv. 1, 2; and iii. 22, 26.



of Scripture, at this distance from the apostles' times, have fallen into contrary sentiments about the meaning of our Saviour's command, and the practice of the apostles in reference to the baptizing of infants.

But since the practice of the ancient Christians, that lived nigh the times of the apostles, being more largely delivered, is more easily known: that such as have gone about to give an account thereof out of the ancient records, should give so contrary accounts as they do, is a great wonder and a great shame.

For they do not only differ in the understanding of the meaning of several of the places produced; but also as to matter of fact, (whether they be rightly cited or not,) do charge one another<sup>b</sup> with forgery: and are come, as Mr. Baxter complains, to 'Thou liest,' and 'Thou liest.' And indeed among all the books of controversy between Papists and Protestants, or others, that are scandalous for false quotations, there is none comparable to one that is written on this occasion, which I shall at present forbear to name.

Such a thing done by mistake, or for want of skill, is bad enough; but if it be done wilfully, it is hard to think of any thing that is a greater wickedness; for it goes the way to destroy the common faith of mankind, by which we are apt to rely upon a writer, that how zealous soever he may be for his opinion, he will not forge matters of fact, nor *speak wickedly* (though it be) *for God*, as Job says<sup>c</sup>.

Some other accounts also are very partial, mentioning only that which makes for their side, and leaving out parts of the clauses which they cite.

<sup>b</sup> More Proofs for Infants' Church-membership and Baptism, p. 346.

<sup>c</sup> Job xiii. 7.

The inconvenience of this is the worse, because it is in a matter which would have a great influence to settle and determine this unlucky controversy ; provided that the accounts of the eldest times were given fairly and impartially, and so that the reader might be satisfied of the truth and impartiality of them.

For when there is in Scripture a plain command to proselyte or make disciples all nations, baptizing them ; but the method of doing it is not in all particulars *expressly* directed ; it not being particularly mentioned whether they were to admit into this discipleship and baptism the infants of those that were converted ; as the Jewish church had always done to the infants of proselytes (giving them circumcision, as we know by Scripture, and baptism as we are assured by their records) : or whether they were to proceed in a new way, and baptize only the adult persons themselves : there is nobody that will doubt but that the apostles knew what was to be done in this case : and consequently, that the Christian churches in their time did as they should do in this matter.

And since the apostles lived, some of them, to near the end of the first century, and St. John something beyond it ; and had in their own time propagated the Christian faith and practice into so many countries ; it can never sink into the head of any considering man, but that such Christians as were ancient men about one hundred, or one hundred and fifty years after that time of the apostles' death, which is the year of Christ 200 or 250, must easily know whether infant-baptism were in use at the time of the apostles' death or not : because the fathers of some of them, and grandfathers of most of

<sup>d</sup> See the Introduction.

them, were born before that time, and were themselves infants in the apostles' days; and so were baptized then in their infancy, if then that were the order: or their baptism deferred to adult age, if that were the use then. For such a thing as the general baptizing of infants, being a rite public and notorious, and in which the whole body of the people, poor and rich, pastors and laymen, men and women, are concerned, cannot be forgotten in a short time, nor altered without a great deal of noise. In a point of doctrine delivered by tradition, a mistake may happen: or in the account of some matter of fact done by some particular man: but for a rite of universal concern, a whole church cannot forget it, much less all the churches in several parts of the world in so short a time. We Englishmen cannot be ignorant whether infants were usually baptized in England or not, in queen Elizabeth's days, which is the same distance. The man that thinks this possible, is one that is not used to consider.

It is to be remembered likewise, that the apostles, before they died, chose men of whom they had good proof, to teach the churches the same things that they had done; many of whom lived till a great while after the apostles were dead: which makes the time that needs to be kept in memory so much the shorter.

Some pretend to slight this argument, as not being a Scripture one: but it is that too by a direct consequence. For since the Scripture promises that the church shall be led into all truth, i. e. all truth that is necessary or fundamental; to follow the example of the primitive church must be, by the rule of Scripture, a sure way not to err in fundamentals.

It were (as bishop Stillingfleet observes in an-



other case<sup>e</sup>) ‘a great blot and dishonour to Christian religion, if the primitive churches could not hold to their first institution, not for one age after the apostles : no not the purest and best churches.’

But the truth is, there is no man that does really slight this argument; though those that have no skill in it, or do suspect that it will go against their side, will make as if they did. And therefore you shall see, both on the one side and on the other, those men who, for a flourish, do pretend that they lay small stress on it, as having proof enough from Scripture, yet take all the pains possible to bring this argument to bear on their side; and that so zealously, that they often do it unfairly. There is no Christian that loves to hear or to admit, that all the ancient churches practised otherwise than he does in a controverted matter.

Seeing therefore that all the arguments from Scripture for each side, have been so searched and so often bandied to and fro, that not much more can be said to illustrate them : and that where a command in Scripture is given in brief and general words, the practice of the primitive church thereupon gives us the best direction for the sense in which it is to be applied to particular cases : and that a great many have desired to see the history of this practice fully and fairly represented : I have thought it worth my pains to draw up and publish such a collection as is expressed in the title.

And if any one ask, what there is done in this more than in others that have been already ; I answer,

<sup>e</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, p. 226. Edit. 167—. or in his collected Works, vol. ii.

1. That the best collections of this nature have not been published in the English language; and it is for the use of Englishmen that this is intended.

2. That this is more complete than any I have seen: because among those I have seen, each one omitted some testimonies which the other had: and it is easy for one that collects out of all of them, to have more than any one: beside that, no inconsiderable number of these have been gathered from my own reading.

The first and best collection that I have seen, is Cassander's; then Vossius', and of late Dr. Hammond's, and out of him Mr. Walker's. The rest are mostly intermixt, by those that produce them, with their proofs and arguments from Scripture, and must be picked out: so there are many in the books of Calvin, Bullinger, Featly, Tombes, Marshall, Cobbet, Baxter, Danvers, Wills, &c.

3. I pretend it to be more impartial than the rest: for most of them are collections of such quotations only as make for that side of the question for which they are disputing. And here my reader will say; 'If those produced by you do make some for one side, and some for the other, they will leave us in the same ambiguity that they find us.' To which I must answer; that if he will come to the reading of them with the same resolved impartiality that I set myself to the writing of them, I believe he will find it otherwise. However, the only way to pass a true judgment, is to see both together.

4. I have recited the places more at large than others have done. One single sentence, or (as they frequently cite) a bit or scrap of a sentence, gives but a very imperfect, and oftentimes a mistaken

account of the author's meaning; but the context added shews the tenor and scope of his discourse.

After all, I acknowledge that there are in the books I mentioned, and others, several quotations which I have not here: and the reason is partly because I confine myself to authors that lived and wrote within the first *four hundred* years (though some of them outliving that term, wrote some of their works after it): and that I do, because all men of reading know, that from that time to the time of the Albigenses, about the year 1150, the practice is unquestionable: and partly because many of the quotations were false, and so altered, that when I came to search the original, there was there nothing to the purpose; or they were out of spurious books, &c. I have been forced to write one chapter<sup>f</sup> of this work to give an account what sort of quotations I have left out, and for what reasons: and if any one will inform me of any passage in any author within the term limited, which he, after the reading of the said chapter, shall yet judge to be to the purpose; I will, if I live to see any more editions of this mean work, put it in (if it seem to me to be to the purpose); and that indifferently, whether it make *for* or *against* pædobaptism. For I desire that this collection should be as complete and impartial as may be.

When I say in the title, 'of all the passages,' I do not pretend but that in St. Austin there are a great many more; but all to the same purpose. For he in his disputes with the Pelagians has whole books, wherein he proves original sin from the practice of pædobaptism. In those I have only taken

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. chap. i.



here and there a piece : since every body knows his doctrine.

I have recited the originals of all the principal quotations ; because in this matter writers have so accused one another of forgery or perverting of testimonies by false translations, &c., that people are grown distrustful. Now they will be satisfied that if I have mistranslated any thing, I did not do it willingly ; for then I should never have added the author's own words for the discovery of it.

I have made two parts of this work. The first contains the principal quotations, with some notes drawn from them. I have rejected all the spurious ones : only I have put a few of the most ancient of them together in the last chapter. The first two chapters have no quotations that speak *expressly* of infant-baptism : but of infants being *discipled to Christ*, (which must, I think, import their baptism,) and of original sin as it affects infants : of the necessity of baptism to salvation : of baptism succeeding circumcision, &c. But all the rest are concerning infant-baptism expressly, either *for* or *against* it.

The other part contains an account of some matters proper for the fuller explication of the primitive practice. Of which the chief is, the inquiry concerning the baptism and parentage of those who are brought as instances of persons not baptized in infancy, though born of Christian parents : for which work I wish I had been a little better furnished. Yet I think I have rectified some mistakes concerning some of them that had passed currently.

I have noted in the margin, over against every author, the age wherein he flourished, (or began to be a man of note, by writing books, &c.) viz. how

many years it was after the apostles' time : (which I make to end with the year of Christ 100, though St. John lived a year or two beyond it :) and this I do, because during all the apostles' time, every body is satisfied that the church had an infallible direction.

I think it needful to give the reader notice beforehand, that in the sayings of the Fathers here recited, he will find, that as we, beside the word 'to baptize' do use the word 'to christen' in the same sense, so they used several words to signify baptism. The most usual was ἀναγεννᾶν, to *regenerate* ; which is also a Scripture word for it : sometimes they express it καινοποιεῖν, or ἀνακαινίζειν, to *renew* ; and frequently ἀγιάζειν, to *sanctify*. They frequently by this word 'the *grace*' do mean baptism. Sometimes they call it the *seal*, and frequently φωτισμός, *illumination*, as it is also called, Heb. vi. 4, and sometimes τελείωσις, *initiation*. The sense of the places will shew that where the words are of an infant, or other person, *regenerated, renewed, sealed, enlightened, initiated, sanctified, &c.*, we must understand *baptized*.

I have added a *Dissuasive from Schism*, or men's renouncing Christian communion with one another, on account of this difference in opinion : for which I wish I had a vein of speaking more powerfully. For I am fully persuaded, and clearly of opinion, that neither this nor most of our other differences, are any sufficient or reasonable ground of flying to that dreadful extremity, of separation.

One thing I was resolved on : that if I wrote any thing, it should be something which should give nobody any occasion to force me to write again. I said in the first edition, that if any one would write against this, they should either write

against the men that have been dead these thirteen hundred years ; or, if they found fault with the notes that I have here and there made on their words, as not naturally drawn from them ; my answer was beforehand, that I would refer it to the readers, whether they be or no.

But I find that I must partake of the fate of writers : only mine has been in the main a much more favourable one than came to my share. It becomes me humbly and thankfully to acknowledge on one side, that the honour publicly done to my book, and the kind reception it has had from many worthy men, has been far greater than I can ever think it does deserve<sup>s</sup>. But on the other side, a certain anonymous author of a pamphlet, called 'An Account of the Proceedings in the Convocation, 1705,' did presently upon the first edition give me a rebuke. To which I in the preface to the second edition gave what answer I thought needful. But that pamphlet being now, I suppose, out of print and forgotten, I do not think my answer to it worth reprinting.

Since the second edition, I have had more adversaries. Two or three of which being antipædobaptists, though they could not charge the quotations with any falsehood, yet disliking the consequence which naturally follows from them, (which is, that the Christians in the time of those authors do appear plainly to have baptized their infants,) have laboured strenuously, and by different ways and evasions, to enervate that.

One of them has done this in so large an oration, in such a popular way of pleading, with such wrestling of the sense of the places, and in so challenging

<sup>s</sup> [See Advertisement to vol. iii. p. vi. also vol. iv. p. 4.]



and insulting a manner; that I have been forced to write a Defence of this History against their several attacks. But I was resolved, that I would not, by mixing such various squabbles *pro* and *contra*, interrupt the thread of it: but print the Defence separate. If any reader have been moved with any of their objections, and do think it worth his while to see what I have to say in answer to them; I must desire him to look for it there, and not here.

I have in this third edition added some quotations, which either I have met with in the ancients since the last, or which have been communicated to me by learned men: and some few new remarks. The new quotations do make for infant-baptism: and if I had met with, or there had been communicated, any new ones that had made *against* it, I would, as I once promised, freely have inserted them. But I meet with none. There are some passages of Barnabas, of Dionysius Alexandrinus, of Eusebius concerning Polycrates, &c., which Mr. Gale (one of my said adversaries) has quoted and tried to enforce for antipædobaptism. I have in the said Defence shewn them, I think, to be not to the purpose. And as upon an impartial consideration of them, I think they are not; I have not encumbered the history with them.

I conclude with a story told by Cassander<sup>h</sup>, which he makes long, but the substance is this: ‘A man  
‘of note among the antipædobaptists, being told  
‘that there was a full agreement of all the ancients  
‘who do with one mouth affirm, that this custom  
‘of baptizing infants has been in use ever since the  
‘apostles’ times, confessed ingenuously, that he did  
‘put a great value upon such a consent of the

<sup>h</sup> Præfat. in Testimonia de Pædobaptismo.

‘ church ; and should be much moved with such an  
‘ agreement of the ancient Christian writers ; and  
‘ that if this could be proved by competent tes-  
‘ timonies, he was not so obstinate as to slight so  
‘ forcible a reason : especially if such authors were  
‘ produced to prove this, as lived very nigh the  
‘ apostles’ times. And therefore he earnestly desired  
‘ that the testimonies of this matter should be shewn  
‘ to him. And having read them, and (as he was a  
‘ man of good sense) diligently considered them ;  
‘ he altered that opinion which he had taken up  
‘ from a mistaken understanding of the Scripture.  
‘ Which happened in him because he was endued  
‘ with these three good qualities :

1. ‘ The fear of God and reverence for his word :  
‘ so that it was by occasion of that zeal for truth,  
‘ that he fell into this way.

2. ‘ Judgment and good sense : so that he quickly  
‘ perceived the force of an argument.

3. ‘ Modesty, and a meek temper, which caused  
‘ that when he had heard and comprehended the  
‘ truth, he did not obstinately withstand it.’ To  
which I shall here add an advice of bishop Still-  
fleet to his clergy<sup>i</sup>, whose sayings and advices all peo-  
ple love to hear. ‘ Where the sense [of Scripture]  
‘ appears doubtful, and disputes have been raised  
‘ about it ; inquire into the sense of the Christian  
‘ church in the first ages, as the best interpreter of  
‘ Scripture : as whether, &c. and whether baptism  
‘ were not to be administered to infants,’ &c.

<sup>i</sup> Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy, p. 118. [or in his  
collected Works, folio, vol. iii. p. 659.]

THE  
HISTORY  
OF  
INFANT-BAPTISM.



PART I.





## THE

## CONTENTS OF THE INTRODUCTION.

---

1. THE Jews baptized all proselytes of the nations that were converted to their religion. §. 2. Their proof from Moses' law that they ought so to do. §. 3. They baptized also the infant children whom such proselytes brought along with them to be entered into the covenant of the true God. §. 4. They baptized all such infant children of the heathens as they found, or took in war, &c. §. 5. The great light that this gives for the better understanding the meaning of our Saviour's commission to baptize the nations, Matth. xxviii. 19. The testimony of St. Ambrose, whose meaning seems to be, that John the baptist baptized infants. §. 6. The Jews called such a proselyte's baptism his *being born again*. Which makes our Saviour's speech to Nicodemus, John iii. 3, 5, more easy to be understood. §. 7. A parallel instituted between the Jewish and the Christian baptism. §. 8. The arguments of sir Norton Knatchbull, Mr. Stennet, &c., brought to disprove this custom of the Jews, answered.

THE  
CONTENTS OF THE BOOK.

PART I.

CHAP. I.

In the apo-  
stles' time.

*Quotations out of Clemens Romanus and Hermas, p. 47.*

§. 1. Of original sin, as it affects infants, p. 48. §. 2. Of the necessity of baptism to salvation, *ibid.* §. 3. The substance of that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5, *Except one be born of water, &c.* expressed by Hermas before it was written by St. John, p. 52. §. 4. The holy men of the Old Testament represented in a vision as baptized into the name of Christ by the apostles, after they were dead. The explication given by the ancients of those texts, 1 Pet. iii. 19, and iv. 6, *of the Gospel being preached to them that were dead*, p. 53. §. 5. Of God's tender regard to infants, p. 54. §. 6. That these books of Clemens and Hermas are genuine, p. 55. §. 7. That they were written before St. John wrote his Gospel, p. 56. §. 8. But not so soon after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul as bishop Pearson and Mr. Dodwell place them; proved from Irenæus, p. 59. §. 9. That this Clement is not probably that Clement mentioned Phil. iv. 3, nor this Hermas he that is named Rom. xvi. 14, p. 62.

CHAP. II.

Year after  
the apostles  
40.

*Quotations out of Justin Martyr, p. 64.*

§. 1. Of original sin, needing redemption and forgiveness, beside the guilt of actual sins, p. 64. §. 2. He speaks of baptism, as being to us instead of circumcision. Note on Col. ii. 11, 12, p. 65. §. 3. The plain and simple way of baptism at that



time, p. 66. §. 4. They used the word *regeneration* to express baptism; and constantly understand that text, John iii. 5, of water-baptism, p. 69. §. 5. The modern writers have altered the sense of the word *regenerated*, p. 70. §. 6. St. Justin speaks of infants made disciples, *ibid*. Year after the apostles 40.

## CHAP. III.

*Quotations out of Irenæus, and Clemens Alexandrinus*, p. 71.

67.

§. 1. Irenæus speaks of original sin as affecting all mankind; and calls baptism *redemption*, p. 71. §. 2. He expressly reckons infants among those that are *regenerated*, p. 72. §. 3. He in all other places uses the word *regenerating* for baptizing, p. 73. §. 4. Several instances shewing that the ancients do use this word for baptism, so as to exclude that conversion or repentance that is not accompanied with baptism, from being signified by it, p. 77. §. 5. When infants are said to be *regenerated*, there can in their case be nothing else understood but *baptized*, p. 79. §. 6. Of the time when Irenæus wrote, and the country where he was educated: and how impossible it is to conceive that the Christians then should be ignorant, whether in the apostles' time children were baptized or not, *ibid*. §. 7. A testimony of any Father is not to be so much regarded, as it speaks his opinion; as it is for that it gives an evidence of the practice or belief of the church at that time, p. 82. §. 8. Clemens Alexandrinus uses the word *regenerate* for *baptized* very commonly: and says at one place, that that word is the name for baptism, *ibid*. §. 9. He advises for the sculpture of a seal, the picture of an apostle drawing children out of the water, which must be meant at their baptism, p. 84.

## CHAP. IV.

*Quotations out of Tertullian*, p. 87.

100.

§. 1. A præmonition concerning Tertullian and Origen; that they were guilty of great errors, yet may serve for evidence of the practice of the church at that time. Origen's strange opinion of original sin, that it is derived from sins which the soul has committed before it was united to the body, p. 87. §. 2. Tertullian reckons the time or age of one's receiving *baptism* among those questions that are not essential to it, p. 88. §. 3. He takes it for a *præscription* or standing rule, 'That none can be saved without baptism:' and answers the objection of the

Year after the apostles 100. apostles not being baptized: refuting those that say, 'Faith is sufficient for salvation without baptism,' p. 89. §. 4. He allows laymen to baptize in case of the danger of death; and says, 'If they refuse to do it, they are 'guilty of the party's perdition,' p. 91. §. 5. Speaking of the weightiness of baptism, he advises the delay of it in the case of several sorts of persons; as of infants till they are of age to understand: of unmarried persons and young widows, till the danger of lust be over. And in contradiction to what he had said before, says, 'That an entire 'faith is secure of salvation.' And of infants says, 'What need 'has their innocent age to make such haste for the forgiveness 'of sins?' p. 92. §. 6. He in another book speaks of infants as being *unclean* and *sinful*; and that they are not holy, nor can enter into the kingdom of God till they are baptized: contrary to what he said before, p. 94. §. 7. An attempt to reconcile these differences in his sayings. He seems to have thought, that in case of danger of death, infants, virgins, widows, &c. must be baptized presently; otherwise they might better be delayed, p. 95. §. 8. This is agreed to have been his opinion by several both of the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists. The unfair dealing of Rigaltius, to leave out of the last edition (without giving any reason from the MSS.) those words of Tertullian that were in the former edition, which do plainly express this meaning, p. 98. §. 9. It appears by his words, that baptism of infants and godfathers for them, were then in use, p. 99. §. 10. His absurd comment on Matth. xix. 14, *Suffer little children*, &c. p. 100. §. 11. He says the heathens had a rite of baptizing, and called it *regeneration*, p. 101. §. 12. He takes the *holiness* mentioned 1 Cor. vii. 14, for baptismal holiness *designed* to them, *ibid.* §. 13. His book of baptism had not come into the hands of most of the learned men of the next centuries: or else they would not quote him, as being an heretic. Yet, St. Hierome had seen it, p. 102.

## CHAP. V.

110.

*Quotations out of Origen, p. 103.*

§. 1. That infants were then baptized *by the usage of the church*, p. 103. §. 2. His inquiry for what sins they were baptized, p. 104. §. 3. His testimony that the *apostles ordered* infants to be baptized, p. 105. §. 4. Some passages of his that are to this purpose, but are spurious or doubtful, rejected, p. 106.

§. 5. His homilies on St. Luke were certainly translated by St. Hierome, p. 107. §. 6. What credit is to be given to the others that were done by Rufinus, p. 108. §. 7. An objection of Mr. Tombes' against their being authentic, considered. And in what sense Origen laid any foundation for Pelagianism, p. 110. §. 8. That Rufinus would never have inserted any thing making for the doctrine of original sin: that his private opinion was against it, p. 111. §. 9. He inquires whether the guardian angel given to infants, and spoken of Matth. xviii. 10, be given at their birth or at their baptism, p. 114. §. 10. St. Hierome's testimony that Origen spoke of infants' baptism, p. 118. §. 11. A passage in his Greek remains, like to the foregoing ones, and from whence infant-baptism is proved, p. 119. §. 12. The advantages that Origen had to know the practice of Christians from the beginning, p. 124.

## CHAP. VI.

*Quotations out of St. Cyprian, p. 125.*

150.

§. 1. The letter written by him and sixty-six bishops in council with him, in answer to Fidus, who had asked their opinion, whether an infant might be baptized before he were eight days old, p. 125. §. 2. There is not in all antiquity any piece more clearly proved to be genuine than this letter, p. 133. §. 3. The ignorance of those that inquire, why this council is not in the volumes of councils, p. 135. §. 4. A reflection on that observation of Grotius, that there is in the councils no earlier mention of infant-baptism, than in the council of Carthage, ann. 418. *ibid.* §. 5. St. Austin, who had said that infant-baptism was not instituted in any council, but was ever in use, does not contradict himself in citing this council, which does not institute it, but takes it for granted, p. 136. §. 6. The reason why the arguments used by these Fathers to satisfy Fidus, seem to some men frivolous, *ibid.* §. 7. The force of the argument for infant-baptism from such a debate, managed by so many ancient men, and so nigh the time of the apostles; of whom not one made any doubt but infants were to be baptized, p. 138. §. 8. Of the *kiss of peace*, then usually given to the new baptized person, p. 139. §. 9. They then held, That to suffer an infant to die unbaptized, was to endanger its salvation, *ibid.* §. 10. A mistake of Mr. Daillé in the reading of this letter, *ibid.* §. 11. Another passage of St. Cyprian, speaking of infants as bap-



Year after the apostles 150. tized, p. 141. §. 12. St. Austin's note on it, p. 143. §. 13. Another, of the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, p. 145. §. 14. Note on that text, John iii. 5, and the argument drawn by some antipædobaptists from it, p. 146.

## CHAP. VII.

205. *A quotation out of the council of Eliberis, p. 148.*

§. 1. They speak of some infants carried over from the catholic church to the sectaries, p. 148. §. 2. The severe penance they inflict on such as have, after years of discretion, revolted to the schismatics, and would return to the church, p. 149.

## CHAP. VIII.

214. *Out of the council of Neocæsarea, p. 150.*

§. 1. Can. 6. 'That a woman with child may be baptized when she please,' &c. p. 150. §. 2. The antipædobaptists' explication of the reason of this canon, p. 151. §. 3. The pædobaptists' explication of it, p. 152. §. 4. That the words are capable of either of the senses: but the notation of the word ἴδιος inclines more to the latter, p. 153. §. 5. The emphasis of that word, useful likewise to shew the force of that text, 1 Cor. vii. 1, 2, against polygamists, p. 154. §. 6. Grotius cites Balsamon and Zonaras, as if they had represented the council as determining against infant-baptism, p. 155. §. 7. The words of those two commentators produced at large to the contrary, *ibid.* §. 8. The words of this council prove nothing for or against infant-baptism, p. 158.

## CHAP. IX.

260. *Out of Optatus, bishop of Milevis, p. 160.*

§. 1. The Donatists had no difference with the Catholics about the manner or subject of baptism, p. 160. §. 2. Optatus speaks of baptism as fit for infants, p. 161.

## CHAP. X.

260. *Out of Gregory Nazianzen, concerning St. Basil's being baptized in infancy, p. 162.*

§. 1. Gregory describes baptism by a peculiar sort of periphrasis, 'the diurnal formation,' &c. p. 162. §. 2. He speaks of the same as applied to St. Basil in infancy, p. 164. §. 3. Other proofs of his baptism in infancy, p. 166.

## CHAP. XI.

*Other quotations out of St. Gregory, concerning the doctrine of infant-baptism, p. 168.*

Year after  
the apostles  
260.

§. 1. He had the most reason to be prejudiced against the doctrine of the necessity of infant-baptism, p. 168. §. 2. An abstract of his sermon concerning baptism. The several names of baptism: it is a seal for those that enter into this life, &c. There is no other regeneration but that, p. 169. §. 3. Against the delay of baptism, p. 170. §. 4. His exhortation to parents to baptize their infants without delay, p. 171. §. 5. His answer to the pretences of those that put off baptism, p. 172. §. 6. Infants dying unbaptized, and others that miss of baptism, not by their own fault, will not be punished: but yet neither will they be glorified, p. 174. §. 7. Infants that are in any danger of dying must be baptized presently: others, he advises, should be baptized about *three* years old, p. 177. §. 8. He declares he will baptize no adult person that is an Arian, or does not believe the Trinity, p. 178. §. 9. Some observations from the whole: 1. A plain specimen of Grotius' foul dealing in perverting the sense of Nazianzen's words concerning the loss suffered by infants dying unbaptized, to a quite contrary purpose; as if his meaning were, that infants did not use to be baptized, p. 179. §. 10. 2. An abstract of what Nazianzen appears to have held about the fate of those infants that did obtain baptism, and of those that missed of it, p. 180. §. 11. 3. His and other authors' frequent use of the word *sanctified* or *holy*, for *baptized*. The paraphrase of St. Paul's discourse 1 Cor. vii. 14, given according to their sense: several observations from Scripture and antiquity that do confirm that sense. The inconvenience of some other explications, p. 181. §. 12. An inquiry on occasion of St. Gregory's refusing to baptize Arians, and the Catholics then refusing communion with them: how far the Catholics now can admit the project of the Socinians, called, 'The agreement between the Unitarians and the 'Catholic church,' p. 188. §. 13. They explain the divinity of Christ only by God's inhabiting in him, p. 191. §. 14. They have altered their notion of the λόγος from one extreme to the other; and yet keep their main article still, of Christ's having no nature but the human, p. 192. §. 15. The ill colours they put on the Catholic faith, p. 196. §. 16. The progress they

Year after the apostles 260. boast they should make, if they had a toleration, has no precedent in former ages, p. 198. §. 17. Difference in lesser opinions is no bar against communion: but it is otherwise in fundamentals, p. 200. §. 18. The mean opinion they have of Christ's satisfaction, p. 203. §. 19. The distinct assemblies which they say they will hold for preserving the doctrine of the unity of the Godhead are needless, p. 205. §. 20. Their virulent endeavour to blacken the Nicene Creed, *ibid.*

CHAP. XII.

260. *Out of St. Basil, p. 208.*

§. 1. An abstract of his sermon persuading people to baptism, p. 208. §. 2. Any time of one's life proper for baptism, p. 209. §. 3. He speaks to several of his auditory, as having been instructed in Christian religion from infancy, and not yet baptized, *ibid.* §. 4. Many at that time were persuaded of the truth of Christian religion, and intended to be baptized into it some time or other, but put it off. These men's children were instructed in it, but not yet baptized; because the parents themselves were not yet baptized, p. 218. §. 5. He proves the necessity of baptism from the threat denounced against an infant that was not circumcised on the eighth day, p. 211. §. 6. His pathetical discourse against the delay of repentance and baptism, p. 212. §. 7. He tells some people that had wrote to him of baptism, that they must first be instructed, and then admitted to baptism, p. 214. §. 8. His explication of John iii. 3, 5, *ibid.* §. 9. He speaks of boys and little children joining in the Divine offices, *ibid.* §. 10. He advises Valens to have his child baptized by the Catholics; but Valens would have it done by the Arians, p. 217. §. 11. A disquisition concerning the age of that child, p. 219.

CHAP. XIII.

274. *Out of St. Ambrose, p. 220.*

§. 1. He speaks of infant-baptism being in use in his and in the apostles' time, and as supposing it practised by John the Baptist, p. 220. §. 2. He makes it a question, whether an infant can be saved without baptism, p. 222.

CHAP. XIV.

280. *Out of St. Chrysostom, p. 226.*

§. 1. He says, One in infancy, or one in middle age, or one in



old age, may receive baptism, p. 226. §. 2. He often affirms, Year after that there is no entering the kingdom of heaven without baptism, p. 229. §. 3. He says, Infants are baptized, though they have no sins, p. 231. §. 4. St. Austin's defence of him against the Pelagians, who challenged him for one of their side, p. 232. §. 5. He speaks of infants as ordinarily baptized, p. 236. §. 6. His mention of the sign of the cross made on the infant's forehead at its baptism, p. 237.

## CHAP. XV.

*Out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, before the rise of the Pelagian controversy.* 280.

SECT. I. *Out of St. Hierome's Letter to Leta*, p. 238.

St. Hierome says, If infants be not baptized, the sin of omitting it is laid to the parents' charge, p. 238.

SECT. II. *Out of St. Austin's book de Sermone Domini in monte*, p. 241.

St. Austin explains those words, 1 Cor. vii. 14. *Now are your children holy*, thus, 'Now are your children baptized,' *ibid.*

SECT. III. *Out of St. Austin's books de libero Arbitrio*, p. 244.

§. 1. He makes answer to those that asked, What good baptism does to children before they have any faith, p. 244. §. 2. A reflection on that saying of Grotius, that St. Austin, before he was heated by the Pelagian controversy, never wrote any thing of the condemnation of unbaptized infants, p. 246.

SECT. IV. *Out of St. Austin's books de Baptismo, contra Donatistas*, p. 248.

§. 1. St. Austin's way of managing against the Donatists, p. 248. §. 2. He proves, that infants or others baptized in the right form, though in a schismatical or heretical church, have their baptism valid, p. 250. §. 3. He speaks of infant-baptism as a thing practised by the whole church, and not instituted by any council, but having ever been in use, and ordered by the apostles; and that it is to us instead of circumcision. And though God has commanded both faith and baptism, yet either of them, where the other cannot be had, is available to salva-

Year after tion, p. 251. §. 4. The mistake of those who say, The Donatists  
the apostles denied infant-baptism, p. 257.  
280.

SECT. V. *Out of St. Austin's Letter to Boniface*, p. 260.

§. 1. He answers the question, How the faith of parents stands their children in stead for their baptism, and yet the apostasy of the parent afterward does not hurt the child, p. 260. §. 2. That the validity of the baptism does not depend on the right faith or intention of those that bring the child: the child is supposed to be offered to baptism by the whole congregation that pray for it, p. 263. §. 3. That the parents at that time were usually the godfathers; but that this office might be done by any other that was owner of the child, p. 264. §. 4. In what sense the answer made by the godfather in the name of the child, 'that he does renounce, believe,' &c. is to be understood, p. 265. §. 5. St. Austin speaks of these questions and answers as necessary, p. 273. §. 6. He supposes it to be the belief of all Christians; that children baptized, and dying before actual sin, are undoubtedly saved, p. 274. §. 7. He had no notion of transubstantiation, p. 275. §. 8. The custom then to receive the holy communion every day, or at least every Lord's day, *ibid.* §. 9. He does not pretend that infants have faith: the opinion of the Lutherans, and the fancy of F. Malebranche on that subject, p. 276.

SECT. VI. *Out of the books de Genesi ad literam*, p. 282.

§. 1. A debate concerning the origin of the soul; whether it be by propagation or immediate creation. St. Austin shews that the former agrees best with the doctrine of original sin, p. 282. §. 2. The true reading of a place in St. Austin *de Genesi ad lit.* l. x. c. 23, of 'infant-baptism being ordered by 'the apostles,' restored by bishop Stillingfleet out of the MSS. p. 287.

SECT. VII. *Out of St. Austin's Letter to St. Hierome*, p. 290.

§. 1. St. Austin desires St. Hierome's opinion, how original sin can be explained if the infant's soul be anew created, p. 290. §. 2. The opinion of some moderns of the nature of the soul; and of the antipædobaptists concerning the sleep of the soul, p. 298. §. 3. Private baptism of children in houses not used in

St. Austin's time, except in cases of the utmost extremity. How much the English presbyterians have changed their sentiments about that matter, p. 302. Year after the apostles 280.

## CHAP. XVI.

*Quotations out of some councils of Carthage before the Pelagian controversy, p. 306.* 297.

§. 1. The bishops make a question, whether they shall admit to holy orders those who had been in their infancy baptized by the Donatists, and were since come over to the Catholic church. They ask the opinion of neighbouring bishops, p. 306.

§. 2. They determine afterwards that such may be admitted, p. 309. §. 3. A canon for abating to poor people the fees due for baptizing their children; but thought to be spurious, p. 311.

§. 4. A canon made for the case of such as had been in their infancy carried captive into the country of barbarians, and when returned, could not tell whether they had been baptized before their captivity or not; ordering that such should be baptized, *ibid.*

§. 5. A canon of a former council of Hippo to the same purpose, p. 316. §. 6. A decree afterwards of pope Leo to the same purpose, *ibid.*

## CHAP. XVII.

*Out of the Decretal Epistles of Siricius and Innocentius, bishops of Rome, p. 321.* 284.

§. 1. The gross way of forging decretal epistles for the bishops of Rome of the first ages, p. 321. §. 2. Siricius' epistles are the first that are genuine, all before him are forged, p. 324.

§. 3. He declares the order and practice of the churches to be, that none be baptized but at the set and appointed times of the year for baptism, viz. Easter and Whitsuntide; except infants, sick persons, or others that may be in danger of death before that time, p. 325. §. 4. Proof that this epistle is not forged, as the foregoing are, p. 329.

§. 5. The reason of that order, that no adult person, except in case of necessity, should be baptized but at the times aforesaid: and of the custom of catechising in Lent, p. 331. §. 6. He informs the Christians of Spain, that bishops and presbyters ought to be chosen, not out of new converts, but of such as have been baptized in infancy, p. 333.

§. 7. Innocentius informs Decentius, that though presbyters may baptize infants, only bishops may give them *chrism*, or *confirmation*, *ibid.* §. 8. He repeats to the council of Toledo



Year after the advice of Siricius, that the clergy ought to be chosen, not  
the apostles out of novices, but of such as have been baptized in infancy,  
284. p. 335.

CHAP. XVIII.

293. *Out of Paulinus bishop of Nola : and another Paulinus, deacon of the church of Milan, p. 336.*

§. 1. An inscription composed to be set over the font, mentioning infants there baptized, p. 336. §. 2. That all new baptized persons, young or old, were about this time called *infants*, p. 337. §. 3. An epitaph made on a child seven years old, mentioning his baptism, p. 339. §. 4. Paulinus desires St. Hierome's opinion, how St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 14, calls the children of Christians *holy*, whenas without baptism they cannot be saved, p. 341. §. 5. St. Hierome's answer; agreeing, that without baptism they cannot be saved, p. 342. §. 6. Paulinus the deacon, in relating St. Ambrose's death, mentions some infants then newly baptized, p. 346.

CHAP. XIX.

310. *Out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, after the rise of the Pelagian controversy : as also out of Pelagius, Cælestius, Innocent the First, Zosimus, Julianus, Theodorus Mopsuestensis, &c. and out of the councils of Diospolis, Milevis, Carthage, &c. p. 348.*

§. 1. The occasion the Pelagian controversy gave to speak of infant-baptism, p. 348. §. 2. The account of this controversy given by Mr. le Clerc is very partial for Pelagius, p. 349. §. 3. Pelagius was a Briton, not a Scot: and Cælestius an Irishman, p. 353. §. 4. They vented their opinion against the doctrine of original sin, at first covertly, and by way of objection, p. 355. §. 5. Cælestius being examined at the council of Carthage, anno 412, would not own original sin; yet granted the necessity of infant-baptism, p. 357. §. 6. St. Austin proves against the Pelagians, that infants have sin, because it was acknowledged that they must be baptized, p. 358. §. 7. He refutes that evasion of theirs; that they are baptized not for forgiveness of sins, but to gain them admission into the kingdom of heaven, p. 359. §. 8. And another evasion: that they are baptized for sins committed by their souls in a state of præ-existence, 362. §. 9. He proves that Christ came to save only such as were in a lost condition; and that only such are to be

baptized, *ibid.* §. 10. That there is no middle state between salvation and some degree of damnation, p. 363. §. 11. Refutes those that said, Infants have actual sins, as peevishness, &c. and that they are baptized for them. All the Pelagians owned, that infants are to be baptized, p. 365. §. 12. Cælestius owned that infants have redemption by their baptism, but would not say forgiveness, p. 366. §. 13. The dispute between the Catholics and Pelagians about the necessity of God's grace, p. 367. §. 14. The unfair account of this dispute given by Mr. le Clerc, p. 369. §. 15. How far Pelagius owned God's grace, p. 373. §. 16. How far he recanted what he had said against it, p. 379. §. 17. St. Austin asserts, that the whole church has from of old constantly held, and that he never read or heard of any Christian catholic or sectary, who denied that infants are baptized for forgiveness, p. 381. §. 18. How parents that are by baptism cleansed from original sin, do yet beget children liable to it, p. 384. §. 19. Several interpretations given by the ancients of that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now are your children holy*, conferred together, p. 385. §. 20. St. Hierome's letter to Ctesiphon. Some blasphemous tenets of the Pelagians. St. Austin's letter to Hilarius, and management of the argument for original sin, from Rom. v. p. 391. §. 21. Dispute between St. Austin and the Pelagians, of the possibility of a rich man's being saved, and of the lawfulness of swearing in any case, p. 396. §. 22. The sophistical way of arguing used by the Pelagians, p. 402. §. 23. Pelagius was the first that ever affirmed the blessed virgin Mary to be sinless, p. 404. §. 24. What Pelagius owned, and what he denied, and how he came off in the meeting at Jerusalem, and in the synod of Diospolis. He was forced there to anathematize all those that say, 'unbaptized infants may have eternal life,' p. 407. §. 25. The Greek Fathers condemn Pelagianism as well as the Latin. A reflection on some sayings of Chrysostom and Theodoret, p. 413. §. 26. St. Hierome shews that Pelagius must either own that the baptism of infants is for forgiveness of sins; or else he must make two sorts of baptism, one for infants, and another for grown persons: whereas the Constantinopolitan creed had determined that there is *but one baptism*, and that for the forgiveness of sins, p. 418. §. 27. Pelagius openly denies original sin, and explains what he had said at Diospolis in an equivocal sense, p. 422. §. 28. Synodical epistles from the councils of Carthage and Milevis, anno 416. to pope

Year after  
the apostles  
310.

- Year after the apostles 310. Innocent against Pelagius. And Innocent's answer, p. 424. §. 29. Pelagius' creed, which he sent to Innocent for his own vindication, recited at large; wherein he owns that baptism is to be administered to infants with the same words as it is to elder persons, p. 430. §. 30. His letter sent at the same time; wherein he declares he never heard any one Catholic or sectary deny infants' baptism, p. 446. §. 31. Cælestius' creed, owning that infants are to be baptized for forgiveness of sins, according to the rule of the universal church; and yet maintaining, that they have no sin derived from Adam, p. 451. §. 32. Pelagius also was at last brought to this contradiction; that the baptism of infants is for forgiveness of sins; and yet they have no sin. How he endeavoured to make sense of this, and then gave over disputing, p. 452. §. 33. Pope Zosimus first declares for Cælestius; and sitting in judicature, pronounces his creed (wherein he denied original sin) to be catholic; and afterwards condemns both him and his doctrine, and confesses all persons to be under the bond of original sin till they be baptized. His letters *pro et contra* on this subject, p. 455. §. 34. St. Austin's charitable endeavour to salve the credit of Zosimus, p. 462. §. 35. Cælestius pleads, that so long as one gives baptism to infants, the question whether they have original sin, or not, is not a fundamental one; and a mistake in that is no heresy. St. Austin holds the contrary, p. 464. §. 36. How great opportunities Pelagius and Cælestius had, to know whether there were any Christians in the world that denied infants' baptism; and how much it had been their interest to mention them, if there had been any such, p. 465. §. 37. The second canon of the council of Carthage, anno 418, condemning the Pelagians, who said, Infants were to be baptized for forgiveness of sin, and yet that they had no original sin, p. 467. §. 38. Julian continues the dispute with St. Austin after Pelagius was condemned. He pretending that the Catholics had gone about to make the people believe that he denied baptism to infants, anathematizes any that deny it, p. 472. §. 39. A new device of Theodorus bishop of Mopsuestia, to reconcile these two things; that infants are to be baptized for forgiveness of sin, and yet that they have none, p. 476. §. 40. The tenets of the Semipelagians concerning God's decree about infants obtaining baptism, viz. which shall partake of it, and which not, p. 478.



## CHAP. XX.

*Out of St. Austin and Vincentius Victor, p. 480.*

Year after  
the apostles  
318.

§. 1. The time when Vincentius published his new Hypothesis, p. 480. §. 2. The substance of it, viz. that unbaptized infants should be admitted to paradise, though not to heaven: with St. Austin's answer, p. 482. §. 3. He adds something more to it, viz. that they may possibly go to heaven, but not till the resurrection. St. Austin's answer. The practice of those times in praying for the dead, p. 487. §. 4. The mistake of a late writer in thinking that Vincentius denied infants' baptism, p. 491. §. 5. Vincentius recants what he had written, p. 493. §. 6. A clause that in some copies is added to the second canon of the council of Carthage, anno 418, and a conjecture at the reason why some copies have this clause, and others not, p. 494.

## CHAP. XXI.

*Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, St. Austin, and Theodoret, who wrote each of them catalogues of all the sects of Christians that they had heard of, do none of them mention any that denied infants' baptism, p. 497.*

From the  
year after  
the apostles  
67, to 350.

§. 1. The Donatists, Arians, Pelagians, and all other sects that St. Austin or Pelagius had heard or read of, if they were such as used any baptism at all, did use to give it to infants, p. 498. §. 2. The sects recited by Irenæus; their monstrous tenets about the Deity; the reason of inserting that clause into the creed, 'the Maker of heaven and earth.' What they held singular about baptism, p. 499. §. 3. Of some sects that baptized people after they were dead, and others that baptized a living person in the name of another that was dead: the various interpretations given by the ancients and moderns of that saying of St. Paul, *Why are they then baptized for the dead?* p. 505. §. 4. No sect is said to have had any difference with the church about the baptizing of infants; but the Pelagians differed in their opinion about the effects of it in infants, p. 509. §. 5. Of the Hieracites, who held that no infant can go to heaven. They thought it unlawful to marry or get children, p. 512.

## CHAP. XXII.

*Containing references to the books of some authors of the next succeeding age, p. 516.*

From the  
year after  
the apostles  
300 to 400.

They do all speak of infant-baptism as a thing taken for

granted. A story that will shame our merchants that take no care of instructing and baptizing their negroes, p. 522.

## CHAP. XXIII.

Year after the apostles 300. *Quotations out of some books that are spurious, i. e. not written by those whose names they bear; but yet are proved to be ancient,*  
p. 524.

§. 1. Out of Clement's Constitutions, ordering Christians to baptize their infants; with some account of that book, p. 524.

§. 2. Out of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of Dionysius the Areopagite; answering the objections of the heathens, who derided the Christians for baptizing infants, and for their use of godfathers, p. 526. §. 3. Out of the *Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos* ascribed to Justin Martyr, and the *Quæstiones ad Antiochum* ascribed to Athanasius, concerning the future state of infants of the heathens, and of the infants of Christians dying unbaptized, p. 531.

THE  
INTRODUCTION.

---

§. I. **T**HE meaning and full import of a rule given in any old book for the doing of any thing is not so well apprehended by us, unless we understand the history of that nation and of that time in which the said rule was given. And this holds especially for such rules as are expressed in very short and general words.

For it is common for a rule or law to be so worded, as that one may perceive that the lawgiver has supposed or taken for granted, that the people to whom it was given, did already know and understand some things which were previous to the apprehending of his meaning; so that it was needless to express them. But though these things were ordinarily known to the people of that time and place, yet we that live at so great a distance of time do not know them, without an inquiry made into the history of the state of that time, as to those things which the law speaks of: and consequently without such inquiry the law or rule, that was plain to them, will in many particulars be obscure to us. So, for example, many of the Grecian and Roman laws, whereof we have copies yet extant, would not be well understood by us, unless they were explained to us by such as have skill in the history of the



state of affairs in those empires. And so many passages in the books of the New Testament of our Saviour Christ are not rightly apprehended, without having recourse to the books of the Old Testament, and other books wherein the customs of the Jewish nation are set forth, for understanding the state of religion among that people at that time when our Saviour gave his rules.

And another thing that does much help us in understanding the meaning of any such old law that is given in such short words, is, to observe and learn how the men that lived in or so near that time, that the meaning of the lawgiver must easily be known by them, did practise it. For in what particulars soever we may doubt how or in what manner it is to be executed, their actions and declarations do serve as precedents to us upon the said law. And this holds especially in such laws as have been in continual use from the time of their enacting to this time.

Now our Saviour's law concerning baptizing all the nations, is, as I shewed in the preface, set down in scripture in very short and general words: and many people of later times have doubted whether it is to be understood to reach to the baptizing of infants, or only of adult persons. All that have any doubt, ought to have recourse to the two several helps for understanding the said law which I have here proposed.

I mean, they ought to learn as well as they can, what was the state of the Jewish religion as to baptism, at and before that time when our Saviour gave his order for baptizing all the nations; and what we must suppose the apostles did of themselves

already know concerning its being proper or improper for infants; which it might not be so needful for our Saviour to express in his new direction to them.

And also they ought to learn as well as they can, how the first Christians did practise in this matter; whether they baptized their infants or not.

It is the latter of these two things that I have taken upon me as my task to shew; viz. how the primitive Christians did practise: and this I do by giving you their own words, without omitting any that I know of for the first 400 years after Christ.

But yet some knowledge of the other point also (viz. how the Jews in and before our Saviour's time did use to act in reference to the baptizing of infants) is so very necessary to a right understanding of the words both of our Saviour and his apostles, and also of the primitive Christians; and he that knows nothing of it, is so incompetent a judge of the force of their sayings; that I think it needful for the use of ordinary readers, to premise, by way of introduction, some account of that matter also.

But I do not pretend in this introduction, in which I treat of the custom of the Jews in baptizing infants before our Saviour's time, to do as I do in the book itself, wherein I treat of the custom of the Christians in baptizing them after it; that is, to recite all the authorities that are about that matter. Partly because the quotations for that purpose are to be searched for in books with which I am not so well acquainted; and partly because those few which I shall produce, will make it clear enough that there was such a custom. I shall therefore content myself with reciting such of them as have been already

made use of by learned men : such as Ainsworth on Gen. xvii : Dr. Hammond's Annotations on Matt. iii. xix. xxiii : John iii : item, Six Queries : item, Defence of Infant Baptism : Selden de Jure Nat. et Gent. juxta Hebræos : item, de Synedriis : item, de Successionibus, &c. : Dr. Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii. and John iii : item, Harmony on the New Testament : Luke iii. Jacob Alting, Prælectio 7. de Proselytis : Godwyn's Moses and Aaron, &c. : and the learned author of the Discourse concerning Lent<sup>a</sup>, part ii. chap. 2.

First then, it is evident that the custom of the Jews before our Saviour's time (and, as they themselves affirm, from the beginning of their law) was to baptize as well as circumcise any proselyte that came over to them from the nations. This does fully appear both from the books of the Jews themselves, and also of others that understood the Jewish customs and have written of them. They reckoned all mankind beside themselves to be in an unclean state, and not capable of being entered into the covenant of Israelites without a washing or baptism, to denote their purification from their uncleanness. And this was called the baptizing of them unto Moses.

This custom of theirs is fully and largely set forth by

*Maimonides ; Issuri Bia*, capp. 13, 14.

He had been saying there that the Israelites themselves were entered into covenant by circumcision, baptism, and sacrifice. And then he adds :

<sup>a</sup> A Discourse concerning Lent, in two parts, (published anonymously, but by Dr. George Hooper, bishop of Bath and Wells,) 8vo. London, 1695.



‘ And so in all ages when an ethnic is willing to  
 ‘ enter into the covenant, and gather himself under  
 ‘ the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon  
 ‘ him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised,  
 ‘ and baptized, and bring a sacrifice ; or if it be a  
 ‘ woman, be baptized and bring a sacrifice. As it is  
 ‘ written<sup>b</sup>, *As you are, so shall the stranger be.*  
 ‘ How are you ? By circumcision and baptism, and  
 ‘ bringing of a sacrifice. So likewise the stranger  
 ‘ (or proselyte) through all generations ; by circum-  
 ‘ cision and baptism, and bringing of a sacrifice.  
 ‘ And what is the stranger’s sacrifice ? A burnt of-  
 ‘ fering of a beast, or two turtle-doves, or two young  
 ‘ pigeons, both of them for a burnt offering.

‘ And at this time, when there is no sacrificing,  
 ‘ they must be circumcised and baptized ; and when  
 ‘ the temple shall be built, they are to bring the  
 ‘ sacrifice.

‘ A stranger that is circumcised and not baptized,  
 ‘ or baptized and not circumcised, he is not a prose-  
 ‘ lyte till he be both circumcised and baptized : and  
 ‘ he must be baptized in the presence of three, &c.

‘ Even as they circumcise and baptize strangers ;  
 ‘ so do they circumcise and baptize servants that are  
 ‘ received from heathens into the name of servi-  
 ‘ tude, &c.

‘ When a man or a woman comes to join as a  
 ‘ proselyte, they make diligent inquiry concerning  
 ‘ such, lest they come to get themselves under the  
 ‘ law for some riches that they should receive, or  
 ‘ for dignity that they should obtain, or for fear. If  
 ‘ it be a man, they inquire whether he have not set

<sup>b</sup> Numb. xv. 15.

‘ his affection on some Jewish woman ; or a woman,  
‘ her affection on some young man of Israel. If no  
‘ such like occasion be found in them, they make  
‘ known unto them the weightiness of the yoke of  
‘ the law and the toil that is in the doing thereof,  
‘ above that which people of other lands have, to see  
‘ if they will go back. If they take it upon them  
‘ and withdraw not, and they see that they come of  
‘ love, then they receive them, &c.

‘ Therefore the judges received no proselyte all  
‘ the days of David and Solomon. Not in David’s  
‘ days, lest they should have come of fear : nor in  
‘ Solomon’s, lest they should have come because of  
‘ the kingdom and great prosperity which Israel  
‘ then had. For whoso comes from the heathens  
‘ for any thing of the vanities of this world, he is  
‘ no righteous proselyte. Notwithstanding there  
‘ were many proselytes that in David’s and Solo-  
‘ mon’s time joined themselves in the presence of  
‘ private persons ; and the judges of the great Syne-  
‘ drion had a care of them. They drove them not  
‘ away, after they were baptized, out of any place ;  
‘ neither took they them near to them, until their  
‘ after-fruits appeared.’

Maimonides gives at the same place an account of several circumstances of time, place, &c., observed in this action of baptizing a proselyte. As that,  
‘ they baptized not a proselyte on the sabbath,  
‘ nor on a holyday, nor by night, &c. They do it  
‘ in a confluence of waters, &c. As soon as he  
‘ grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they  
‘ bring him to baptism ; and being placed in the  
‘ water they again instruct him,’ &c. And such a confluence of waters, Jonathan’s Chaldee Paraphrase

determines ought not to be less than forty of the measures called Sata, where he paraphrases on Exod. xxix. Lev. xi. and other places.

The Talmud says the same thing of receiving proselytes by baptism; only, whereas Maimonides speaks of the number of three as necessary to be present at the baptizing; the Talmud Babylon. does not insist on any more than two grave men.

*Talmud Babylon. Mass. Jevamoth. fol. 47.*

‘ When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised; and then when he is cured (of the wound of circumcision) they baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying, Behold he is an Israelite in all things: or if it be a woman, the women lead her to the waters,’ &c.

But the Talmud Hierosol. Jevamoth says as Maimonides does, that ‘ a proselyte has need of three<sup>c</sup>.’ And directs the other circumstances as he does, viz. ‘ They do not baptize a proselyte by night<sup>d</sup>.’ And, ‘ they were not baptized till the pain of circumcision were healed<sup>e</sup>.’

And the same continues to this day to be the practice of the present Jews. For so Leo Modena<sup>f</sup>, in his history of them, part v. chap. 2, speaking of a proselyte’s admission; ‘ They take and circumcise him; and as soon as he is well of his sore, he is to wash himself all over in water: and this is to be done in the presence of the three rabbins, &c. And so, from thenceforth, he becomes as a natural Jew.’

<sup>c</sup> Fol. 46. 2.

<sup>d</sup> Fol. 46. 2.

<sup>e</sup> Fol. 41. 2.

<sup>f</sup> The History of the Rites, Customs, and Manner of Life of the present Jews throughout the World; translated (from the Italian) into English, by Edmund Chilmead. 12mo. London, 1650.



The books do speak of this washing, or baptism, as absolutely necessary; and an ordinance, without which none was to be counted a proselyte. So

*Gemara Babylon. ad tit. Cherithoth, cap. ii.*

‘The proselytes entered not into covenant, but by ‘circumcision, baptism, and sprinkling of blood.’

And *Tit. Jabimoth, cap. iv.*

‘He is no proselyte unless he be circumcised and ‘baptized.’ And ‘if he be not baptized, he remains a ‘Gentile’ (or Pagan). And there is in that chapter a proof given of that opinion of the necessity, which I shall have occasion by and by to mention.

Maimonides says the same thing, as we saw in the chapter I quoted before<sup>g</sup>.

Also the Talmud, Tract. Repudii, speaking of Jethro, Moses’s father-in-law :

‘He was made a proselyte by circumcision and ‘immersion in waters.’ Godwyn, in his *Moses and Aaron*, lib. i. cap. 3.

To the making of a male proselyte at first three things were required: 1. circumcision; 2. a kind of purification by water; 3. the blood of oblation. Moses Kotsen<sup>h</sup>, fol. 20. Of a woman proselyte were required only purification by water, and oblation, Drusius<sup>i</sup> *de tribus Sectis*.

This custom of the Jews continued after Christ’s time, and after their expulsion from the Holy Land; and continues (as I shewed from Leo Modena) to this day, if there be any that nowadays do turn pro-

<sup>g</sup> Issuri Bia, c. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Rabbi Moses ben Jacob Kotsiensis, ‘*Liber Præceptorum magnus*,’ fol. Venetiis, 1522. *ibid.* 1547.

<sup>i</sup> Johannes Drusius ‘*de tribus Sectis Judæorum*.’ 8vo. Frane-keræ, 1605. 4to. Arnhemii, 1619.

selytes to their religion. Wherever they sojourned, if they found any of that country that chose to be of their religion, they would not admit him, unless he would first be washed or baptized by them. And some heathen writers do express a great deal of scorn and disdain at this their valuing themselves upon their own purity in comparison with other nations. So Arrianus, a philosopher at Rome, (about the year of Christ 147,) jeers<sup>k</sup> those that turned proselytes to the Jews, calling them *βεβαμμένους*, dipped: and describes their custom to be, that when a man is so dipped by them, then he is accounted *τῷ ὄντι Ἰουδαῖος*, a right Jew: and calls one that is a counterfeit proselyte to them, *παραβαπτιστήν*, one that puts an abuse upon their ceremony of baptism.

This solemn baptizing of proselytes differed from the rest of their divers baptisms (which St. Paul, Heb. x. 10, says were customary among the Jews) in this: that those others were upon new occasions of uncleanness, &c. many times repeated; but this was never given but once to one person. It was called (as Dr. Lightfoot shews<sup>l</sup>) ‘baptism for proselytism,’ distinct from ‘baptism for uncleanness.’

II. It is not very material to our purpose to inquire upon what reasons or authorities this custom of the Jews, of baptizing all proselytes, was grounded. All that is material, is to know that they had time out of mind such a custom. And for that, the sayings of their own writers here produced are a sufficient evidence. Yet I shall spend a few words in shewing how they prove the necessity of this washing, or baptizing, from Moses’ law.

<sup>k</sup> Dissert. in Epictet. lib. ii. c. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matth. iii. 6.

They take notice that Moses, Numb. xv. 15, orders thus, *One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger (or proselyte) that sojourneth with you. An ordinance for ever in your generations : As ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord. One law and one manner shall be for you and for the stranger, &c.* Now they reckon that the Israelites themselves were at their entering into covenant with God at the time of their receiving the law in mount Sinai, all of them washed or baptized. So they understand those words, Exod. xix. 10, *And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day : for the third day the Lord will come down, &c.* They understand the meaning of that command by which Moses was to sanctify the people on those two days, to be the washing of them : and so that word, *to sanctify*, does commonly signify in the Jewish law, (as several writers have shewn by many instances, and I also do in this book<sup>m</sup> give some) especially when it is spoken of a man sanctifying other men. And Maimonides, Mickvaoth. item More Nebochim, part iii. c. 33, says ; This is a rule ; that ‘ whereso-  
‘ ever in the law the washing of the body or gar-  
‘ ments is mentioned, it means still the washing of  
‘ the whole body.’ And the same is affirmed, Gemara Babyl. Tit. Jabimoth, c. iv. fol. 46. And so Aben Ezra, on that place of scripture<sup>n</sup> where Jacob being to meet with God at Beth-el, said to his household ; *Be clean, and change your garments ;*

<sup>m</sup> Part i. chap. II. §. 11.

<sup>n</sup> Gen. xxxv. 2.



understands the washing of their bodies. And Selden<sup>o</sup> shews by the expositions which the Jewish commentators give on Levit. xi. 25, 28, 40 : xiv. 8, 47 : Numb. xix. 10, 21 : xxxi. 24. and several other texts where washing of garments is mentioned, that they always understand washing of the whole body. And for the like understanding of the foresaid place in Exod. xix. 10. quotes Mechilta, Nachmanid, R. Bechai, Moses Mikotsi, &c.

That they gave this (baptism of the Jews, and the command for proselytes to be as the Jews were) as a proof that proselytes must be baptized, appears by the words of Maimonides in the place before quoted. For he first says thus: ‘ By three things did Israel  
‘ enter into covenant, by circumcision, and baptism,  
‘ and sacrifice. Circumcision was in Egypt, as it is  
‘ written, *No uncircumcised<sup>p</sup> person shall eat there-*  
‘ *of,* &c. Baptism was in the wilderness just before  
‘ the giving of the Law : as it is written<sup>q</sup>, *Sanctify*  
‘ *them to day and to morrow, and let them wash*  
‘ *their clothes.* And sacrifice ; as it is said<sup>r</sup>, *And he*  
‘ *sent young men of the children of Israel which*  
‘ *offered burnt offerings,*’ &c.

And then he adds that which I recited before, concerning proselytes ; ‘ and so in all ages when an  
‘ ethnic is willing, &c., he must be circumcised, and  
‘ baptized, and bring a sacrifice ; as it is written, *As*  
‘ *you are, so shall the stranger be,*’ &c.

And so says the *Talmud, Tract. Repud.*

‘ Israel does not enter into covenant but by these  
‘ three things, by circumcision, baptism, and peace  
‘ offering ; and the proselytes, in like manner.’

<sup>o</sup> De Synedr. lib. i. c. 3.    <sup>p</sup> Exod. xii. 48.    <sup>q</sup> Exod. xix. 10.

<sup>r</sup> Exod. xxiv. 5.

And again, *ad Tit. Cherithoth*, cap. ii.

‘ *As you are, so shall the stranger be. As you are, that is, as was done to your fathers. And what was done to them? Your fathers did not enter into covenant but by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood. So neither do proselytes enter into covenant but by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood.*’

And *Rabbi Solomon*, *in loc.*

‘ Our rabbies teach that our fathers entered into covenant by circumcision, and baptism, and sprinkling of blood,’ &c.

The ancient Christians, especially such of them as lived in places where they could have converse with the learned Jews, and might learn from them the meaning of the Hebrew phrases used in the Old Testament, do also speak of this baptism of the Jews.

So Gregory Nazianzen, *Orat. 39.* shewing the preference of the Christian baptism before the Jewish, says, Ἐβάπτισε Μωσῆς, ἀλλ’ ἐν ὕδατι καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ. τυπικῶς δὲ τοῦτο ἦν, ὡς καὶ Παύλῳ δοκεῖ, &c. ‘ Moses gave a baptism, but that was with water only. And before that they were baptized in the cloud and in the sea. But these were but a type (or figure) of ours; as Paul also understands it.’

And *St. Cyprian*, *Epist. 73. ad Jubaianum.*

‘ Alia enim fuit Judæorum sub apostolis ratio, alia est Gentilium conditio. Illi, quia jam legis et Moysi antiquissimum baptismum fuerant adepti, in nomine quoque Jesu Christi erant baptizandi.’

‘ The case of the Jews who were to be baptized by the apostles was different from the case of the Gentiles; for the Jews had already, and a long time ago, the baptism of the Law and of Moses;

‘ and were now to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.’

Also St. Basil, in his oration of Baptism, compares together the baptisms of Moses, of John, and of Christ. Whose words I shall quote, part i. chap. 12. sect. 7. of this collection.

And before them all, Tertullian, having in his Book of Baptism, chap. v. sect. 5. shewn by several particulars, that the heathens had used of old a certain rite of baptizing, which they said was for their regeneration, and for the forgiveness of their sins, applies to it this observation ; *Hic quoque studium Diaboli cognoscimus res Dei æmulantis, cum et ipse baptismum in suis exercet.* ‘ Here we see the aim of the Devil to ape (or imitate) the things of God ; ‘ since he also sets up a baptism for his disciples.’

Now the divine baptism, which, he says, the Devil imitated, must be the Jewish baptism. For the rites of Apollo and Ceres (in which he there instances, as those in which the said baptism was used) were long before the times of the Christian baptism. The place I recite among some other passages of Tertullian, part i. chap. 4. sect. 11.

And Mr. Selden, de Synedr. lib. i. cap. 3. observes that that saying of St. Paul, 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, *All our Fathers were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea*, would have been difficult for those to whom St. Paul wrote, to make any sense of; had it not been a thing well known at that time when the apostle wrote, that the Jews looked upon themselves as having been entered into covenant by baptism : and that St. Paul spoke as alluding to that. And Dr. Hammond concludes the same<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> Six Queries, Inf. Bapt. sect. 7, 8. [in vol. i. of his works.]



III. Secondly, it is to be observed, that if any such proselyte, who came over to the Jewish religion and was baptized into it, had any infant children then born to him; they also were at the father's desire circumcised and baptized, and admitted as proselytes. The child's inability to declare or promise for himself was not looked on as a bar against his reception into the covenant: but the desire of his father to dedicate him to the true God, was counted available, and sufficient to justify his admission. So that it was with such a proselyte as it was with Abraham at his first admission to the covenant of circumcision: as Abraham of ninety-nine years old, and Ishmael his son of thirteen years old, and all the males in his house that were eight days old or upward, were circumcised at the same time; so such a proselyte with all his, were both baptized (and circumcised if they were male children) and had each of them a sacrifice (such as was by law<sup>t</sup> required for a Jew's child) made for them; but if females, they were baptized, and a sacrifice was offered for them.

And the reason which the Jewish writers give, why it was not necessary to stay to see whether the child, when come to age, would be willing to engage himself in the covenant of the true God, or not, is this; that it is out of the reach of any doubt or controversy, that this is for his good. Where there may be any question made whether a thing be beneficial, or not; the concerns of a child are not to be disposed of by another: but here the benefit of being dedicated to Jehovah, (of which dedication

<sup>t</sup> Luke ii. 24.

these rites were the sacrament and seal) is evident and unquestionable. One may (as they give the reason) ‘privilege a person, though he be incapable of knowing it; but one ought not to disprivilege a person without his knowledge.’

They judge therefore that a proselyte had no more need to expect his child’s consent to be cleansed by this baptism or washing from the unclean and accursed estate in which he was born, than a natural Jew had to make any such delay in giving his child circumcision, the seal of the covenant. Which delay, instead of being cautious, would have been impious. This reason of theirs will appear in their sayings, which I am now going to produce.

*Gemara Babylon. Chethuboth, cap. i. fol. 11.*

‘If with a proselyte his sons and his daughters be made proselytes; that which is done by their father redounds to their good.’

And it is not only the Gemara, (which perhaps some will object against as not being ancient enough,) but the text of the Misna itself, (which is a system of the traditions and received customs of the Jews, compiled within one hundred years of the time of John’s and Christ’s baptizing, as learned men<sup>u</sup> have computed the distance,) mentions the same usage. For the Misna Chethuboth, both in the Babylonian and in the Jerusalem Talmud, speaks of a child becoming, or being made, a proselyte. The Jerusalem Misna says, ‘that if a girl, born of heathen parents, be made a proselyte after she be three years and a day old, then she is not to have such and such privileges there mentioned.’ And that of the Babylon

<sup>u</sup> Dr. Prideaux, *Connexion*, book v. and Dr. Wotton, *Preface to Miscellaneous Discourses*, 2 vols. 8vo. Lond. 1718.

edition says, ‘ that if she be made a proselyte before  
 ‘ that age, she shall have the said privileges.’ Both  
 agreeing (as Selden, reciting<sup>x</sup> those places observes,)  
 ‘ that a child of never so little age might by their  
 ‘ custom be made a proselyte.’ Which is also shewn  
 by Dr. Wotton to be a just consequence from the  
 words of that law, which he cites more largely, and  
 in the original. Misc. Disc. vol. i. c. 8. And then  
 the Gemara there gives the reason, or rather takes  
 off the objection which might be made because of  
 their nonage; saying,

‘ They are wont to baptize such a proselyte in  
 ‘ infancy upon the profession of the House of judg-  
 ‘ ment (the court). For this is for his good.’

And the gloss there (having first put in an excep-  
 tion, that if the father of the child be alive and pre-  
 sent, the child is baptized at his request; but if not,  
 on the profession of the court) comments thus on  
 those words :

They are wont to baptize. ‘ Because,’ says the  
 gloss, ‘ none is made a proselyte without circumci-  
 ‘ sion and baptism.’ Upon the profession of the  
 House of judgment. ‘ That is, the three men have  
 ‘ the care of his baptism, according to the law of  
 ‘ the baptism of proselytes, which requires three  
 ‘ men, who do so become to him a father. And he  
 ‘ is by them made a proselyte,’ &c.

So that, as Selden there expresses it, ‘ A prose-  
 ‘ lyte, if of age, made profession to the court that he  
 ‘ would keep Moses’ law. But in the case of  
 ‘ minors the court itself did profess in their name  
 ‘ the same thing. Just as in the Christian church

<sup>x</sup> De Synedriis, lib. i. cap. 3.



‘ the godfathers do ; at least if their parents were  
‘ not there to do it for them.’

And Maimonides, in the chapter I quoted before, Issuri Bia, c. 13. §. 7. after he has discoursed what I there recited of the baptism of grown persons made proselytes, adds the same that the Gemara had said.

‘ A proselyte that is under age they are wont to  
‘ baptize upon the knowledge (or profession) of the  
‘ House of judgment (or court); because this is for  
‘ his good.’

If a child were fatherless, and his mother brought him, they baptized him at her desire ; but the court professed for him, as the Gemara says at the place forecited.

Concerning the age of the child to be baptized, they had this rule : ‘ Any male child of such a proselyte, that was under the age of thirteen years and a day, and females that were under twelve years and a day, they baptized as infants at the request and by the assent of the father, or the authority of the court ; because such an one was not yet the son of assent, as they phrase it, i. e. not capable to give assent for himself, but the thing is for his good. If they were above that age they consented for themselves.’ This Selden shews, both in his book *de Jure Nat. et Gent. juxta Hebræos*, lib. ii. cap. 2, and also *de Synedr.* lib. i. cap. 3, by particulars too large to be inserted here.

Rabbi Joseph indeed gives this sentence, that when they grow to years they may retract. Where the gloss writes thus : ‘ this is to be understood of little children who are made proselytes together with their fathers.’ And the same is the opinion

of some people concerning Christians' children baptized in infancy. But the council of Trent anathematizes<sup>y</sup> this opinion.

What has been said of the baptism of children of proselytes is to be understood of such children as were born before the parents themselves were baptized; for all the children that were born to them afterward, they reckoned were clean by their birth; as being born of parents that were cleansed from the polluted state of heathenism, and that were in the covenant of Abraham, and were become as natural Jews. They therefore did by them only the same thing that the natural Jews did by their children; that is, for the male children they used circumcision, and sacrifice, or offering; and for the females only a sacrifice.

Dr. Hammond did indeed once maintain the contrary in a dispute<sup>z</sup> with Mr. Selden and Mr. Tombes<sup>a</sup>, and thought that both the children of natural Jews were wont to be baptized, and also the children of proselytes born after their parents' baptism. But the learned men that have since made a more exact inquiry in the books of the learned Jews, have found and given their verdict, that Selden was in the right, and the doctor in a mistake in that matter. And

<sup>y</sup> Sess. 7. Can. de Baptismo 14.

<sup>z</sup> Defence of Infant Baptism, 4to. 1655: reprinted in the second volume of his works, in folio.

<sup>a</sup> [John Tombes, a learned baptist minister, published several pieces on the subject of infant-baptism, chiefly against S. Marshal, R. Baxter, H. Savage, J. Cragg, and H. Vaughan, between the years 1646 and 1659. Dr. Hammond replied to part of his 'Anti-pædobaptism.' See the opinion which Dr. Wall entertained of his abilities, in part ii. ch. 2, of this work.]

Bishop Taylor, Mr. Walker<sup>b</sup>, &c., have followed him in that mistake.

The natural Jews reckoned that neither they themselves nor their children did stand in any need of this baptism, never since the time (which I mentioned before) when their whole nation, men, women, and infants, were baptized before the giving of the law on mount Sinai. It was our Saviour who first ordered by himself and by his forerunner, that every particular person, Jew or Gentile, or of what parents soever born, must be *born<sup>c</sup> again of water*. As for the proselytes' baptism, it was a rule among them, as Mr. Selden shews<sup>d</sup>, that 'it was never re-iterated on him or his posterity.' And as other learned men do shew, that *filius baptizati habetur pro baptizato*; 'he that is born of a baptized parent 'is accounted as baptized.' And Dr. Lightfoot<sup>e</sup> gives this as their rule, 'The sons of proselytes, in following generations, were circumcised indeed, but not baptized—as being already Israelites.'

And though the child were begotten and conceived in the womb before the parents were baptized; yet if they (and particularly if the mother) were baptized before it was born into the world, the Jews had a saying (which is quoted by Dr. Hammond<sup>f</sup> himself) recorded by Maimonides, Iss. Bia. cap. 13. and also in the Talmud.

<sup>b</sup> [See A Modest Plea for Infants' Baptism, wherein the Lawfulness of the baptizing of Infants is defended against the Anti-pædobaptists, &c., by W. W[alker], B. D. 12mo., Cambridge, 1677.]

<sup>c</sup> John iii. 3. 5.

<sup>d</sup> De Jure Nat. et Gent. lib. ii. cap. 2.

<sup>e</sup> [Horæ Hebraicæ on St. Matthew, iii. 6 : in his Works, vol. ii. p. 120.]

<sup>f</sup> Six Queries, Inf. Bapt. §. 109.



‘ A heathen woman, if she is made a proselytess  
 ‘ when big with child, that child needs not baptism ;  
 ‘ for the baptism of the mother serves him for bap-  
 ‘ tism.’

IV. Thirdly, this is also plainly proved and agreed by all the learned men aforesaid, and by all others, to have been the custom of the Jews ; that if they found any child that had been exposed in the fields, woods, or highways by the heathens, or if they took in war any infant children, whom they brought home as booty, and intended to bring them up in their religion, they baptized them in infancy, and accounted them as proselytes. So says

*Maimonides, Halach Aibdim, c. 8.*

‘ An Israelite that takes a little heathen child, or  
 ‘ that finds an heathen infant, and baptizes him for  
 ‘ a proselyte : behold he is a proselyte.’

At this baptism of such a child the owner of him was wont to determine whether he should be a slave or a freeman : and he was baptized in the name of the one or of the other accordingly. To which purpose is that rule of rabbi Hezekiah, set down in the

*Hierosol. Jevamoth, fol. 8. 4.*

‘ Behold, one finds an infant cast out, and bap-  
 ‘ tizes him in the name of a servant. Do thou also  
 ‘ circumcise him in the name of a servant. But if  
 ‘ he baptize him in the name of a freeman : do  
 ‘ thou also circumcise him in the name of a free-  
 ‘ man.’

These cases were very frequent. For besides that many proselytes of the Gentiles came over with their children ; the Jews’ custom in war was to bring away the children of the people whom they conquered, that they might either make servants of

them, or if they took a liking to them, adopt them for their own. And it was a common thing with the heathens to expose their infants, whom they would not be at the charge to bring up, in the highways, &c. So that Dr. Lightfoot says<sup>g</sup>, ‘The baptizing of infants was a thing as well known in the church of the Jews, as ever it has been in the Christian church.’

V. Now this gives great light for the better understanding the meaning of our Saviour, when he bids his apostles<sup>h</sup> ‘Go and disciple all the nations, and baptize them.’ For when a commission is given in such short words, and there is no express direction what they shall do with the infants of those who become proselytes; the natural and obvious interpretation is, that they must do in that matter as they and the church in which they lived always used to do.

As now at this time, if an island or country of heathens be discovered, and a minister be sent out to them by the bishops of the church of England, who should say, ‘Go and convert such a nation, and baptize them;’ he would know without asking any question, that he must baptize the infants of those who, being converted, offered them to baptism; because he knows that to be the meaning and the custom of that church or bishop, by which he is sent. And on the contrary, if any one were sent from a church or congregation of antipædobaptists with a commission of the same words, ‘Go and convert such a nation, and baptize them;’ he would take it for granted that he must baptize none of

<sup>g</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii. 6.

<sup>h</sup> Matt. xxviii. 19.

their infants, because he knows that to be contrary to the meaning and custom of the church that sends him.

So when the apostles were sent out to the heathen nations with a commission of no other words than these, *Go and disciple* (or proselyte) *all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*: when the case came in hand, of the infant children of those that were discipled, what could they think other but that they must do with them as had been usually done in that church in which they and their Master had always lived? Since the nations were to be proselyted, how could they, without particular order, alter any thing in the customary way of receiving proselytes of the nations? For to disciple the nations to Christ, is the same thing as to proselyte them to him: and probably in the Hebrew text of St. Matthew, was the same word: and we see that the customary phrase and language of the Jews was to call the infants *young proselytes*, or *disciples*; as I shall shew that Justin Martyr<sup>i</sup>, one of the eldest Christian writers, calls the Christian infants likewise.

If our Saviour meant that the apostles should make any alteration in that matter, and not baptize the infants, as had been usually done; it is a wonder He did not say so.

The antipædobaptists depend upon this as an unerring rule; that since our Saviour did not say (or at least St. Matthew does not recite that he said) baptize the infants also; his meaning must have been that they should not baptize them.

<sup>i</sup> Part i. ch. 2. §. 6.



But if they would put this case; suppose our Saviour had bid the apostles, *Go and disciple all the nations*, and (instead of baptizing had said) circumcise them: an antipædobaptist will grant that in that case, without any more words, the apostles must have circumcised the infants of the nations as well as the grown men, though there had been no express mention of infants in the commission: so that that is not always an unerring rule.

And what is the reason that in case circumcision had been appointed for the nations, it must have been of course given to infants, though they had not been expressly named? The reason is this: because the apostles knew of themselves, that circumcision was usually given to infants. If it do appear then, that baptism was also usually given to infants, and the apostles must know it, the same reason would direct them to the same interpretation.

If it had been circumcision that had been ordered, the apostles going out into the nations must have circumcised the grown men at the age that they found them of: but they would have circumcised the infants also; because one that is to be circumcised at all should be circumcised in infancy, if one has then the power or direction of him. So they must baptize the grown men among the nations at the age that they found them of: and we have reason to conclude that they must think themselves obliged to give baptism (or order it to be given) to the infants also; because by the rules of baptism received in their nation, all that were to be baptized at all, were baptized in infancy, if they had then the power and direction of them.

And though the proof that circumcision was

usually given to infants, is taken from the writings of the Old Testament; but the proof that baptism was usually given to the infants of proselytes is taken only from the testimonies of the Jews themselves: yet the Jews themselves (how fallible soever they are in judging of the meaning of the law, what ought to be done, or how necessary it was, yet) cannot fail of being sufficient witnesses of the matter of fact, and able to tell what was actually done among themselves.

The difference which the Jews made between themselves and other nations in giving baptism to Gentile proselytes and their children, but not to themselves nor their own children, does not at all affect the question that is disputed between the Christian pædobaptists and antipædobaptists: because in respect of the Christian religion the Jews themselves have the same need of becoming proselytes and of being baptized, that other nations have. The gospel has concluded all under sin: and St. Paul, speaking of this very matter of baptism<sup>k</sup>, says, that in respect of it *there is neither Jew nor Greek*, i. e. there is no difference between them. The Jews themselves do seem to have understood, that when the Christ came, their nation must be baptized as well as others: and therefore they asked John, (who baptized Jews,) *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias*<sup>l</sup>? &c., signifying that if he had been the Christ or Elias, they should not have wondered at his baptizing of Jews.

The same thing is to be said of that tenet of the Jews, that the infant children of a proselyte, born to him before his baptism, are to be baptized; but

<sup>k</sup> Gal. iii. 27, 28.

<sup>l</sup> John i. 25.

not the children born to him after his baptism, nor any of their posterity in any succeeding generations, they being now looked on as natural Jews.

This, I say, does not affect the question of Christian pædobaptism. Because that privilege which the Jew had, or supposed himself to have, above other people, is as to the Christian dispensation abolished: and because both the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists are agreed that all persons do now need baptism; as well those that are born of baptized, as those that are born of unbaptized parents: our Saviour having satisfied Nicodemus<sup>m</sup> that *that which is born of the flesh* (whether of a Jewish or Gentile, baptized or unbaptized parent) *is flesh, and must be born again.*

The antipædobaptists are satisfied of this; the only question is, at what age they must be baptized. Now the practice of the Jews before and in our Saviour's time was, that all persons whom they baptized at all they baptized in infancy, if they had, as I said, the power or possession of them in infancy. And in this matter our Saviour gave no direction for any alteration. 'He took' (as Dr. Lightfoot<sup>n</sup> says) 'into his hands baptism such as he found it; 'adding only this, that he exalted it to a nobler purpose and to a larger use.'

Some Socinians indeed would have the use of baptism to be abolished in all Christian nations, where the body of the people has once been generally baptized: and do say of Christian baptism, as the Jews did of theirs, that the baptism of the forefathers is sufficient for them and all their posterity. This reason against the continuance of baptism, which

<sup>m</sup> John iii. 6, 7.

<sup>n</sup> Hor. Hebr. in Matt. iii. 6.



was never thought a reason by any Christians before, Socinus gave about 150 years ago; ‘Water  
 ‘ baptism seems unnecessary for those that are born  
 ‘ of Christians, and do imitate their parents in the  
 ‘ profession of Christianity. It matters not whether  
 ‘ such be baptized or not. And if they be, it is all  
 ‘ one whether it be at their adult age or in infancy<sup>o</sup>.’  
 Which opinion, or one more against baptism, the  
 Quakers have since taken up. But the antipædo-  
 baptists do hold it necessary, as I said, for every  
 particular person, and not only for a nation at the  
 first planting of Christianity.

And it is easy to guess what it was that swayed  
 Socinus into the other opinion; viz. his desire of  
 abolishing the doctrine of the Trinity: which it was  
 hard to accomplish so long as persons were continu-  
 ally baptized into that faith.

There never was any age (at least since Abraham)  
 in which the children, whether of Jews or proselytes,  
 that were admitted into covenant, had not some badge  
 or sign of such their admission. The male children  
 of Abraham’s race were entered by circumcision.  
 The whole body of the Jews, men, women, and chil-  
 dren, were in Moses’s time baptized. After which  
 the male children of proselytes that were entered  
 with their parents, were (as well as their parents)  
 admitted by circumcision, baptism, and a sacrifice:  
 the female children by baptism and a sacrifice. The  
 male children of the natural Jews, and such male  
 children of proselytes as were born after their pa-  
 rents’ baptism, by circumcision and a sacrifice: and  
 the female children by a sacrifice offered for them  
 by the head of the family. Now after that circum-

<sup>o</sup> Epist. de Baptismo, apud Vossium de Baptismo, Disp. 13.

cision and sacrifice were to be abolished, there was nothing left but baptism, or washing, for a sign of the covenant and of professing religion. This our Saviour took (probably as being the easiest and the least operose of all the rest; and as being common to both sexes, making no difference of male or female) and enjoined it to all that should *enter into the kingdom of God*<sup>p</sup>. And St. Paul does plainly intimate to the Colossians, ch. ii. 11, 12. that it served them instead of circumcision: calling it *the circumcision of Christ*, or *Christian circumcision*.

The baptism indeed of the nations by the apostles ought to be regulated by the practice of John and of Christ himself, (who by the hands of his disciples baptized many Jews,) rather than by any preceding custom of the Jewish nation; if we had any good ground to believe that they did in the case of infants differ, or alter any thing from the usual way. But we have no kind of proof that they made any such alteration. The commission which our Saviour gave to his disciples to baptize in the country of Judæa, during his abode with them, is not at all set down, as I said. And what John did in this particular, we have no means left to know, but by observing what was done before and after.

There is no express mention indeed of any children baptized by him; but to those that consider the commonness of the thing (which I have here shewn) for people that came to be baptized to bring their children along with them, that is no more a cause to think that he baptized no children, than one's minding that in the history of the Old Testament there is sometimes 500 years together without.

<sup>p</sup> John iii. 5.

the mention of any child circumcised, is a cause to think that none were circumcised all that while. And whereas it is said of the multitudes that came to John, that they *were baptized by him confessing their sins*, (which confession can be understood only of the grown persons,) that is no more than would be said in the case of a minister of the church of England (which I put before) going and converting a heathen nation. For in a short account which should be sent of his success, it would be said that multitudes came and were baptized, *confessing their sins*: and there would need no mention of their bringing their children with them; because the converting of the grown persons was the principal and most difficult thing, and it would be supposed that they brought their children of course.

I shall, at ch. 13. of this my collection, shew it to be probable that St. Ambrose does take it for granted that John must have baptized infants as well as others: for he does by way of allusion make a comparison between Elias and him; and speaks of Elias' turning the waters of Jordan back toward the spring-head, as a type of the baptism of infants, by which they were reformed from their natural corrupt state back again to the primitive innocence of nature. And St. Ambrose does not there stand to prove that any infants were baptized: but speaks of it as of a thing commonly so understood by all Christians. And so Dr. Lightfoot says on this account<sup>q</sup>, 'I do not believe the people that flocked to John's baptism were so forgetful of the manner and custom of the nation, as not to bring their little children along with them to be baptized.'

<sup>q</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii.



And the same man, who was most excellently skilled in the books and customs of the Jews, says at another place<sup>r</sup>; ‘ If baptism and baptizing infants ‘ had been a new thing, and unheard of till John ‘ Baptist came, as circumcision was till God appointed it to Abraham; there would have been, no ‘ doubt, as express command for baptizing infants, ‘ as there was for circumcising them. But when ‘ the baptizing of infants was a thing commonly ‘ known and used, as appears by incontestable evidence from their writers; there need not be express assertions that such and such persons were ‘ to be the object of baptism: when it was as well ‘ known before the gospel began, that men, women, ‘ and children were baptized, as it is to be known ‘ that the sun is up, when’ &c.

And he deduces the argument with great evidence in this fashion<sup>s</sup>;

‘ The whole nation knew well enough that infants ‘ were wont to be baptized. There was no need of ‘ a precept for that which was always settled by ‘ common use. Suppose there should at this time ‘ come out a proclamation in these words: Every ‘ one on the Lord’s day shall repair to the public ‘ assembly in the church. That man would dote, ‘ who should in times to come conclude that there ‘ were no prayers, sermons, psalms, &c. in the public ‘ assemblies on the Lord’s day, for this reason, ‘ because there was no mention of them in this ‘ proclamation. For the proclamation ordered the ‘ keeping of the Lord’s day in the public assemblies ‘ in general: and there was no need that mention

<sup>r</sup> Harmony on John i. 25.

<sup>s</sup> Hor. Hebr. on Matt. iii.

‘ should be made of the particular kinds of divine  
 ‘ worship there to be used; since they were both  
 ‘ before and at the time of the said proclamation  
 ‘ known to every body, and in common use.

‘ Just so the case stood as to baptism. Christ  
 ‘ ordered it to be for a sacrament of the New  
 ‘ Testament, by which all should be admitted to the  
 ‘ profession of the gospel, as they were formerly to  
 ‘ proselytism in the Jews’ religion. The particular  
 ‘ circumstances of it, as the manner of baptizing, the  
 ‘ age of receiving it, which sex was capable of it, &c.,  
 ‘ had no need of being regulated or set down, be-  
 ‘ cause they were known to every body by common  
 ‘ usage.

‘ It was therefore necessary on the other side,  
 ‘ that there should have been an express and plain  
 ‘ order that infants and little children should not be  
 ‘ baptized, if our Saviour had meant that they should  
 ‘ not. For since it was ordinary in all ages before  
 ‘ to have infants baptized; if Christ would have had  
 ‘ that usage to be abolished, he would have expressly  
 ‘ forbidden it. So that his and the scriptures’ silence  
 ‘ in this matter does confirm and establish infant-  
 ‘ baptism for ever.’

VI. Fourthly, another thing observable about the Jewish baptism of proselytes, is this; that they called such an one’s baptism his *new-birth*, *regeneration*, or *being born again*.

This was a very usual phrase of the Jews.

*Gemara, tit. Jevamoth, cap. 4. fol. 62. 1.*

‘ If any one become a proselyte, he is like a child  
 ‘ new born.’

*Maimonides, Iss. Bia, cap. 14. s. 11.*

‘ The Gentile that is made a proselyte, and the

‘ slave that is made free ; behold, he is like a child  
‘ new born.’

The rabbies do much enlarge on this privilege of a proselyte’s being put into a new state, and putting off all his former relations : those that were akin to him before are now no longer so ; but he is just as if he were born of a new mother, as the Talmud often expresses it. And it was probably from the much talk that they made on this subject, that Tacitus the Roman historian (who lived in the apostles’ time) drew the notion he had of the Jews’ practice in initiating proselytes.

‘ The first thing,’ says he<sup>t</sup>, ‘ that they teach them  
‘ is, to despise the gods, (which they worshipped before,) to renounce their country : *parentes, liberos, fratres, vilia habere* ; to make no account of their  
‘ parents, children, or kindred.’

And some do think that St. Paul alludes to this notion, when he says, 2 Cor. v. 16, 17, *Henceforth know we no man after the flesh, &c. If any one be in Christ, he is a new creature. Old things are passed away, &c.* And St. Peter, when he calls the Christians *new born babes*<sup>u</sup>.

The Talmudical doctors do indeed carry on this metaphor of the new birth too far in all reason : they determine that it is no incest for such an one to marry any of his nearest kindred, because upon his being new born all former relations do cease ; so that if he marry his own mother, he does not sin.

But letting pass the vain and absurd consequences which they drew from this figurative speech, it is abundantly evident that the common phrase of the

<sup>t</sup> Hist. lib. v. c. 5.

<sup>u</sup> 1 Ep. ch. ii. 2.



Jews was to call the baptism of a proselyte, his regeneration or new birth.

And the Christians did in all ancient times continue the use of this name for baptism, so as that they never use the word *regenerate*, or *born again*, but that they mean or connote by it *baptism*. Of which I shall produce no proof here, because almost all the quotations which I shall bring in this book will be instances of it.

Now the knowledge of this makes those words of our Saviour to Nicodemus in the third chapter of St. John to be much more intelligible to us; where he tells him, that, *except any one be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God*. He used that which was then the ordinary phrase. All that was new in that saying of our Saviour was this; the Jews knew that any Gentile that would enter the kingdom of God must be born again; but our Saviour assures Nicodemus, that every one, Jew or Gentile, must be so born. And when Nicodemus did not apprehend his meaning, but took the words in a proper sense, our Saviour speaks plainer, and says, that *every one must be born of water, &c.*, wondering at the same time, that he, being a master in Israel, had not understood him.

This puts it beyond all doubt that our Saviour is to be understood there of baptism, (of which some people, since the disuse of the word *regenerated* or *born again* for *baptized* have made a doubt,) and also guides us into a ready conception of the sense of those sayings of the ancient Christian writers where they use the word; and of St. Paul for one, when he mentions *the washing of regeneration*<sup>x</sup>.

<sup>x</sup> Tit. iii. 5.

There are some other more plain and gross mistakes made by some men in the understanding of those words of our Saviour to Nicodemus: as, that of those who being able to read none but the English translation, where it is worded, *Except a man be born again, &c.*, do conceive that they concern only grown men: and that of those who tell us, that by *the kingdom of God* in that text is meant, not the kingdom of glory, but something else. The absurdity of which mistakes will be occasionally shewn in the following collection of the sayings of the eldest Christians, who do very frequently quote this text.

VII. It may be useful to illustrate the point in hand, if we do here institute a parallel between the Jewish and the Christian baptism, and the modes and circumstances used in each; by which it will more plainly appear, that St. John, and our Saviour, and the apostles and primitive Christians, had an eye to the Jewish baptism in many of the rites and circumstances which they used at the administration of the Christian baptism: as all agree they had to the Jewish passover in the ordering of the other sacrament.

1. As there was a stipulation made by the whole people of the Jews just before their baptism, Exod. xix. 5, *If you will keep my covenant, &c.* the people answering, ver. 8, *All that the Lord has spoken we will do, &c.* And Moses returned the words of the people to the Lord, &c. And the Lord said, ver. 10, *Go and sanctify them, and let them wash their clothes,* (i. e. their whole bodies.)

And as the Jews did accordingly afterwards

require, of any that were to be proselyted or entered as disciples to their religion, a stipulation to renounce idolatry, &c. Maimonid. Iss. Bia. cap. 13. §. 14, 15; and to believe in Jehovah :

So the Christians required a like sort of stipulation of all whom they baptized : and being taught that all idolatry is offering to devils, they expressed it, *Renouncing the Devil and all his works, &c.* And to believe in the Trinity. From whence it is probably, that St. Peter, 1 Ep. iii. 21, calls baptism *ἐπερώτημα*, the interrogation, or stipulation, of a good conscience.

2. As the Jews, though the person to be baptized had before made this profession, yet interrogated him again as he stood in the water ; as appears by the words of Maimonides, quoted §. 1 :

So the Christians required of all adult persons that were to be baptized, that beside the profession made before in the congregation, they should answer to each interrogatory of it over again, when they were going into the water : as I shew, pt. ii. c. 9. §. 13.

3. As the Jews baptized the infant children of such proselytes as desired that their children should be entered into covenant with the true God ; so I have, through all the first part of this work, given the history of what the Christians did in respect of the infant children of Christian proselytes. And I believe all impartial readers of it will conclude that they did the same.

4. As the Jews required, that for an infant proselyte either his father or else the consistory (or church) of the place, or at least three grave persons, should answer or undertake at his baptism : (and



they required the like at circumcision, as Buxtorf in his Synag. Jud. has fully shewn, and is not by any denied:)

So the Christians (as I shall shew at pt. ii. c. 9. §. 13.) did the same; putting the several interrogatories of the Creed, and of the renunciations, and requiring the child's answer by his parents or other sponsors.

5. As such a proselyte of the Jews, when baptized, was said to be born again: so our Saviour, and the apostles and primitive Christians, gave the same term to Christian baptism. As appears, John iii. 3, 5; Tit. iii. 5, and in almost all the passages of this my collection.

6. The Jews told such a proselyte, that he was now taken out of his unclean state, and put into a state of sanctity or holiness, Iss. Bia. cap. 14. §. 14.

So the scriptures of the New Testament do call the baptized Christians, the *saints*, the *holy*, the *sanctified* in Christ Jesus; and say, that the church of them is *sanctified with the washing of water*, &c. Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2. item, vii. 14; Eph. v. 26. And it will appear by many quotations which I shall produce from the ancient Christians, that there is nothing more common with them than to call baptism by the name of *sanctification*, and to say *sanctified* or *holy* instead of *baptized*, and to give to persons, while they continue unbaptized, the name of *unclean*.

7. The Jews declared the baptized proselyte to be now under the wings of the divine majesty, or Shechinah: Iss. Bia. c. 13. §. 4.

This was more visibly made good to the new baptized Christians, by palpable signs and effects of the

Holy Spirit coming on them. And as the laying on of the hands of an apostle was in the primitive church employed to procure this, (or of a bishop as the supreme pastor when the apostles were dead, for obtaining the more ordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit;) so there is good reason to believe that the Jews had before used this ceremony of laying on of hands on this occasion, for it was a thing used by them on almost all occasions that were solemn.

8. The paschal season is known to have been the most solemn time, both with the Jews and Christians, for admitting proselytes or disciples by baptism. The Jews did then baptize all the proselytes that were ready, for this reason, that they might be admitted to partake of the passover and sacrifices. The Christians observed the same time for a like reason.

9. In the Jews' time, some Gentiles were absolute idolaters; some came nearer to the Jews' religion, believing their God to be the true God, and were called *proselytes of the gate*. And of these last, some who declared their desire to be circumcised and baptized, and submit to the whole law, were (for some time before their circumcision and baptism) distinguished from the rest.

So in the first preachings of Christianity in heathen places, some slighted it; some gave so much regard to it, as to hear at least what the Christians preached, and were called *audientes*. Some, beginning to approve it, submitted to a course of catechising, and were called *catechumens*. And of these, such as desired baptism, and were now fit for it, were called *competentes*.

Now both under the Jewish and Christian dis-

pensation, these men, as they stood in the said different degrees of preparation to baptism, had different places and liberties of access, both among the Jews to their temple and synagogues, and among the Christians to their churches and public offices; as is largely shewn from Jewish and Christian antiquities by the author (whom I mentioned before) of the Discourse concerning Lent<sup>y</sup>.

And those degrees of preparatory admission did so resemble one another, that it is plain that the first Christians imitated the Jews in the steps that they made towards admitting a proselyte to baptism.

It is true, that sometimes a person was convinced, converted, and believed, and was baptized, all in a short time; as the eunuch, the jailor, &c. But this was extraordinary, and the ordinary course was as I have said.

10. There were some other customs constantly used by the most ancient Christians at and after the baptizing of any person; which (since they are not mentioned in any command of our Saviour or the apostles recorded in the New Testament) one might wonder from whence they had them. As namely,

1. When they baptized any one, whether infant or adult, they thought it not enough to put him once into the water; but as his body was in the water, they put his head also three times into the water, so that his whole body was three several times under water. This was the ordinary way, (but with an exception of sick, weakly persons, &c.) as I shew pt. ii. c. 9. §. 2. and 4.

2. And after he came out of the water, they gave

<sup>y</sup> See note at p. 4.



him to taste a portion of milk and honey mixed together.

3. And also they then anointed him with a sort of precious ointment.

The first Christians were too plain men to invent these things of themselves. And yet they were universally used. The books of the second century do speak of them as customs used time out of mind, and of which they knew no beginning.

The heretics also of the same time used them, as I shew in pt. ii. c. 9. §. 6. item 8. So that the beginning of them must have been from a principle universally received.

And this could not probably come, but from such like customs used by the Jews at their baptizing of a proselyte. The author, whom I last mentioned, shews the probability of this for the two last; viz. the anointing, and the milk and honey: one, a ceremony much used by the Jews (and probably the Jewish proselyte was anointed with the blood of his own sacrifice that he offered): the other, the emblem of the Holy Land, to the enjoyment whereof he was now entitled. And for the first of the three, viz. the trine immersion; another person very learned in Jewish customs assures me, that their way of washing any person, or any thing, that was by their law to have a *tevillah*, or solemn washing, was to do it three times over: so that a vessel that was to be washed, was drawn three times through water. And Mr. Selden says<sup>z</sup>, ‘it must be the same quantity of water as that wherein a proselyte was baptized.’ Whence it is probable that they gave the

<sup>z</sup> De Synedr. lib. i. c. 3.

proselyte a trine immersion ; and that the Christians by their example did the like.

VIII. I shall conclude this introductory discourse with observing what a weak attempt that is, which sir Norton Knatchbull<sup>a</sup> has made to disprove this custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes ; and how unlike to the rest of his annotations on the New Testament, which are deservedly valued. That learned gentleman seems to have had some disgust against Dr. Hammond, and to have endeavoured to oppose him in several of his criticisms and observations. Such a prejudiced endeavour does often lead men from a true judgment of things into a vein of cavilling. The doctor (but not he alone, but with him all that ever had any skill in the Jewish learning) had spoke of this custom of giving baptism to proselytes : and he had produced, among other proofs of it, a quotation out of the Gemara, (which I purposely omitted before, because it must be set down here.) Sir Norton picks out<sup>b</sup> one clause of that quotation, which taken by itself might seem to make for his purpose ; which is, that rabbi Eliezer had said, of one that was circumcised, and not baptized, that he was a proselyte. Now see the quotation at large.

*Gemara, tit. Jevamoth, c. 4.*

‘ Of him that was circumcised, and not baptized,

<sup>a</sup> [Annotations upon some difficult Texts in all the Books of the New Testament, by sir Norton Knatchbull, Kt. and Bart. This work was first published in Latin, in 1659, and twice reprinted in that language : but the author left at his death an English version with his last remarks and corrections ; which was published at Cambridge in 1693, and is the edition here referred to.]

<sup>b</sup> Annot. on 1 Pet. iii. 21. p. 306—309.

‘ rabbi Eliezer said, that he was a proselyte. Because, said he, we find of our fathers (Abraham, Isaac, &c.) that they were circumcised, but not baptized.

‘ And of him that was baptized, and not circumcised, rabbi Joshua said, that he was a proselyte. Because, said he, we find of our mothers, that they were baptized, and not circumcised.

‘ But the wise men pronounced, that till he were both baptized and circumcised, he was not a proselyte.’

The question here was not whether proselytes ought, or were wont, to be baptized: but whether one that had neglected it, or by some chance had missed of it, could be counted for a proselyte. And the like question was made of one that had missed of circumcision. And Eliezer’s maintaining that one might possibly without baptism go for a proselyte, is no more an argument that proselytes were not usually baptized, than Joshua’s maintaining that one might without circumcision go for a proselyte, is an argument that proselytes were not usually circumcised. So far is that from being a good conclusion which sir Norton there draws from Eliezer’s words, viz. that he did expressly deny this baptism. On the contrary, the tenor of the discourse shews that it had been taken for granted and agreed, that a proselyte ought of right to have both circumcision and baptism: only Joshua had a favourable opinion against the absolute necessity of the first, as Eliezer had of the latter (and both of them were also declared singular in such their opinions); so that upon the whole this quotation does prove that which sir Norton Knatchbull brought it to disprove.



I give an account in the twentieth chapter of this book, how one Vincentius Victor maintained a dispute against St. Austin, that a child dying unbaptized might yet possibly be partaker of all that measure of glory which is promised to Christians. From whence a certain late antipædobaptist raised an argument, that Vincentius held that children were not to be baptized. Whereas Vincentius's words do, as I there shew, sufficiently prove, that he knew that children ought of right to have baptism: only he puts the case of a child that had missed of it. This argument, drawn from Eliezer's words to prove that proselytes were not wont to be baptized, runs on the same foot, and is as weak as that. It is certainly one thing to say, a person though not baptized might be accounted a proselyte, or, a child dying unbaptized may be saved: and another very different thing to say, that either one or the other were not wont, or ought not to be baptized. So that it is hard to guess what Mr. Stennet thinks he has gained to his cause by quoting so largely this discourse of sir Norton Knatchbull in his late book<sup>c</sup>.

Some objections Mr. Stennet adds there of his own, to overthrow this argument taken from the Jewish baptism: as that, 'If the Jews practised baptism to initiate proselytes, it must have been an invention of their own; for no such initiation is commanded in the law of God.'

<sup>c</sup> [Answer to Mr. David Russen's book, entitled *Fundamentals without a Foundation, or a true Picture of the Anabaptists*. Svo, London, 1704. Dr. Stennet, a learned baptist divine, was born in 1663, and died in 1713. See an account of his character and works, in Crosby's *History of the English Baptists*, vol. IV. p. 319, &c. and in Ivimey's *Hist. of the Engl. Baptists*, vol. III.]

But, 1, he may see that they quoted texts in the law of God for what they did in this matter.

And, 2, putting the case that they mistook the sense of those texts; yet when they had upon that authority established a practice of baptizing proselytes and their children; and that practice had now continued for many ages: if our Saviour had meant that his apostles in baptizing proselytes of the nations should have altered that practice, we have all the reason in the world to think that he would have forewarned them of it. And since he did not, we have reason to think that the Jews were not mistaken in what they did.

Suppose our Saviour had ordered his apostles to require the nations to keep the feasts. If he had meant that they should not keep the feast of the dedication, (which had no divine institution, but yet being become customary was observed by all the Jews, and even by Christ himself,) as well as the passover and the rest, (which had been commanded in the law,) he would doubtless in that case have excepted that. And there is the same reason in the case before us.

But that which Mr. Stennet there says in a challenging manner to Mr. Russen<sup>d</sup>, (who had mentioned this practice of the Jews,) ‘Where does he find that the Jews always did and do still baptize infants; and that, to initiate them into the mysteries of religion?’ is too securely spoken. He may see here as in a specimen, but much more largely in the books of Selden, Lightfoot, &c. to which I have here referred, that they bring full proofs of the ancient practice of the Jews in this matter. And that the Jews do still

<sup>d</sup> [See the preceding note.]

continue so to do, there is no other question; than as it is a question, whether any proselytes do nowadays either come over themselves, or bring their children to be at all initiated in their religion: for the books that order the initiating of infants by baptism, are such as the present Jews do own for orthodox and authentic. Sir Norton Knatchbull has one argument which I wonder much at him for using, and at the other for borrowing it of him: because it had been very commonly answered long before he used it: which is; that if baptizing of proselytes had been in ordinary and familiar use with the Jews, the Pharisees would not have said to John; *Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias<sup>e</sup>?* &c.

If John had been then baptizing Gentile proselytes, and had not baptized the natural Jews; the Pharisees would not at all have wondered to see converted Gentiles baptized. Though the office of doing even that was probably not accounted lawful for any but such as had a commission from the Sanhedrim; which John, we suppose, had not: and therefore they might even in that case have examined by what authority he did it.

But the case here was quite otherwise. The multitudes whom John baptized, were mostly, if not all, natural Jews. And the Pharisees and other Jews (knowing that their own nation was not to have any other baptism than what they had already, till the Christ should come, or Elias his forerunner) looked upon this practice to be in effect the setting himself up for the Christ, or at least for Elias, (as he was indeed that '*Elias* (or forerunner) *which*

<sup>e</sup> John i. 25.

<sup>f</sup> Matt. xi. 14.



*was for to come,)* and therefore it was that they sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him; *Who art thou?* And that all men mused in their hearts concerning him, whether he were the Christ or not. Luke iii. 15.

Ainsworth, Lightfoot, Hammond, and every one that has occasion, do shew the easiness of solving this doubt. The first of these, having largely shewn how common and known a custom this baptism of proselytes was, adds at the end of it<sup>h</sup>, ‘Hereupon ‘baptism was nothing strange to the Jews when ‘John the Baptist began his ministry, Matt. iii. 5, 6. ‘They made question of his person that did it; but ‘not of the thing itself, John i. 25.’

And it is plain that their questions put to John do naturally import no other. They do not ask him, What meanest thou? or, What wouldst thou signify to us by this new ceremony of baptizing? nor any question like that: but *Who art thou?* And when he confessed, John i. 20, *I am not the Christ*, they say, *What then? Art thou Elias?* &c. and when he said, *I am not*, (meaning that he was not Elias in that proper sense that they dreamt of; for they expected that very same person that had been carried to heaven,) they asked further; *Who art thou? What sayest thou of thyself? Why baptizest thou then*, (meaning the nation of the Jews,) *if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias, &c.*

All this has nothing in it to evince the contrary but that the Jews themselves did use before to baptize such heathens as came over to them. And indeed such a pompous recital of arguments that have been long ago commonly answered, may serve to

<sup>g</sup> John i.

<sup>h</sup> Gen. xvii.

amuse such as have not read the answers : but it is not fair nor ingenuous dealing for any learned men to use them for that purpose. It brings on the world that great inconvenience of being forced in books to say *pro* and *contra* the same things over and over again.





THE HISTORY  
OF  
INFANT-BAPTISM.

PART I.

CHAP. I.

*Quotations out of Clemens Romanus and Hermas.*

*Clemens Romanus*, Epist. 1 ad Corinthios, xvii.

§. I. ἜΤΙ δὲ καὶ περὶ Ἰωβ οὕτω γέγραπται, Ἰωβ ἦν CHAP. I.  
δίκαιος καὶ ἄμεμπτος, ἀληθινὸς, θεοσεβὴς, In the apo-  
stles' time.  
ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ. Ἄλλ' αὐτὸς ἐαυτοῦ  
κατηγορῶν λέγει· Οὐδεὶς καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ρύπου, οὐδὲ εἰ μιᾶς  
ἡμέρας ἢ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ.

‘Again of Job it is thus written, That he was  
‘just and blameless, true, one that feared God, and  
‘eschewed evil. Yet he condemns himself, and says,  
‘There is none free from pollution; no, not though  
‘his life be but of the length of one day.’

These words of Job are quoted from chap. xiv. 4,  
where the English translation is, *Who can bring a  
clean thing out of an unclean? not one.* But in the  
Greek translation made by the Septuagint, which  
was in use in the times of our Saviour and the apo-  
stles, they are as Clement here renders them; and  
they are accordingly so read by all the primitive

CHAP. I. Christians. And you will see in the following quotations that they often from thence conclude the necessity of baptism for the forgiveness of sins, even of a child that is but a day old. And in the next chapter he brings in, to the same purpose, the saying of David, Psalm li. 5.

In the apostles' time.

Ibid. cap. 38.

Ἀναλογισώμεθα οὖν, ἀδελφοὶ, ἐκ ποίας ὕλης ἐγεννήθημεν, ποῖοι καὶ τίνες εἰσῆλθομεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ τάφου καὶ σκότους. Ὁ ποιήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δημιουργήσας εἰσῆγαγεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον αὐτοῦ, προετοιμάσας τὰς εὐεργεσίας αὐτοῦ πρὶν ἡμᾶς γεννηθῆναι.

‘ Let us consider, therefore, brethren, whereof we  
‘ were made; who and what kind of persons we  
‘ came into this world, as if it were out of a sepulchre,  
‘ and from utter darkness. He that made and  
‘ formed us, brought us into his own world, having  
‘ prepared for us his benefits before we were born.’

That which I produce these places for is, to shew what the doctrine of this apostolical man was, concerning the pollution and guilt with which infants are born into this world.

*Hermas Pastor*, lib. i. Visione 3. c. 3.

II. He having there described an emblem or vision, shewed him by a woman who represented the church, concerning a certain tower built on the water, by which the building of Christ’s church was signified, has these words :

‘ Interrogavi illam, Quare turris ædificata est  
‘ super aquas, Domina? Dixeram tibi et prius versutum te esse, circa structuras diligenter inquirentem :  
‘ igitur invenies veritatem. Quare ergo super aquas  
‘ ædificatur turris, audi. Quoniam vita vestra per  
‘ aquam salva facta est, et fiet.’

‘ I asked her, Why is the tower built on the water? She answered, I said before that you were wise to inquire diligently concerning the building; therefore you shall know the truth. Hear, therefore, why the tower is built on the waters; Because your life is saved, and shall be saved by water.’

CHAP. I.

In the apostles' time.

By this is denoted, that baptism with water is appointed the sacrament of salvation to such as are saved; which meaning will more plainly appear by the import of the passage following.

*Hermas Pastor*, lib. iii. Similitud. 9. c. 15 et 16.

He is there relating a vision of the same import as the other; the building of the church represented by the building of a tower, wherein all things are shewed and explained to him by an angel. He sees some stones put into this building that were drawn up from the deep; and others that were taken from the surface of the earth; the first denoting persons already dead; the other, persons yet alive.

Of those drawn up from the deep, he saw first ten stones, which filled one range of building next the foundation, then twenty-five more, then thirty-five more, then forty more. And afterward in the explication of the vision, he asks the angel:

‘ *Lapides vero illi, domine, qui de profundo in structura aptati sunt, qui sunt? Decem, inquit, qui in fundamentis collocati sunt, primum seculum est: sequentes viginti quinque secundum seculum est justorum virorum. Illi autem triginta quinque<sup>a</sup> prophetæ Domini ac ministri sunt. Quadraginta*

<sup>a</sup> [Cotelerius omits the word *quinque* in this clause, but it seems to be merely a typographical error; compare c. 4.]



CHAP. I. ‘ vero, apostoli et doctores sunt prædicationis Filii  
 In the apo- ‘ Dei. Quare, inquam, de profundo hi lapides as-  
 stles’ time. ‘ cenderunt, et positi sunt in structuram turris hujus,  
 ‘ cum jam pridem portaverint spiritus justos? Ne-  
 ‘ cesse est, inquit, ut per aquam habeant ascendere,  
 ‘ ut requiescant: non poterant enim aliter in regnum  
 ‘ Dei intrare, quam ut deponerent mortalitatem  
 ‘ prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei  
 ‘ signati sunt, et intraverunt in regnum Dei. Ante-  
 ‘ quam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, morti  
 ‘ destinatus est: at ubi accipit illud sigillum, libera-  
 ‘ tur a morte et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum  
 ‘ aqua est, in quam descendunt homines morti obli-  
 ‘ gati, ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. Et illis igitur  
 ‘ prædicatum est illud sigillum, et usi sunt eo ut  
 ‘ intrarent in regnum Dei.

‘ Et dixi, Quare ergo, domine, illi quadraginta  
 ‘ lapides ascenderunt cum illis de profundo, jam ha-  
 ‘ bentes illud sigillum? et dixit, Quoniam hi apo-  
 ‘ stoli et doctores, qui prædicaverunt nomen Filii  
 ‘ Dei, cum habentes fidem ejus et potestatem de-  
 ‘ functi essent, prædicaverunt his qui ante obierunt:  
 ‘ et ipsi dederunt eis illud signum. Descenderunt  
 ‘ igitur in aquam cum illis, et iterum ascenderunt.  
 ‘ Sed hi vivi descenderunt<sup>b</sup>: at illi qui fuerunt ante  
 ‘ defuncti, mortui quidem descenderunt, sed vivi  
 ‘ ascenderunt. Per hos igitur vitam receperunt et  
 ‘ cognoverunt Filium Dei; ideoque ascenderunt cum  
 ‘ eis, et convenerunt in structuram turris. Nec  
 ‘ circumcisi, sed integri ædificati sunt, quoniam  
 ‘ æquitate pleni cum summa castitate defuncti sunt:

<sup>b</sup> [Cotelerius reads in the text *ascenderunt*, and gives in the margin as a conjecture, f. ‘descenderunt et iterum vivi ascenderunt.’]

‘ sed tantummodo hoc sigillum defuerat eis. Habes CHAP. I.  
‘ horum explanationem.’

In the apostles' time.

‘ But, sir, what are those stones that were taken  
‘ out of the deep and fitted into the building?

‘ The ten, said he, which were laid in the founda-  
‘ tion, are the first age: the next twenty-five, the  
‘ second age, of righteous men. The next thirty-  
‘ five, are the prophets and ministers of the Lord:  
‘ and the forty are the apostles and teachers of  
‘ the preaching of the Son of God. Why, said I, did  
‘ these stones come up out of the deep to be placed  
‘ in the building of this tower, since they had the  
‘ just spirits before: (viz. of justice, temperance,  
‘ chastity, &c., which he had mentioned before.)

‘ It was necessary, said he, for them to come up  
‘ by (or through) water, that they might be at rest;  
‘ for they could not otherwise enter into the king-  
‘ dom of God, than by putting off the mortality of  
‘ their former life: they therefore, after they were  
‘ dead, were sealed with the seal of the Son of God,  
‘ and so entered into the kingdom of God. For be-  
‘ fore any one receives the name of the Son of God,  
‘ he is liable to death: but when he receives that  
‘ seal, he is delivered from death, and is assigned to  
‘ life. Now that seal is water, into which persons  
‘ go down liable to death, but come out of it as-  
‘ signed to life. For which reason to these also was  
‘ this seal preached; and they made use of it that  
‘ they might enter into the kingdom of God.

‘ And I said, Why then, sir, did those forty stones  
‘ which had already that seal, come up with them  
‘ out of the deep?

‘ He answered, Because these apostles and teachers  
‘ that preached the name of the Son of God, dying

CHAP. I. ‘ after they had received his faith and power, preach-

In the apostles’ time.

‘ ed to them that were dead before, and gave to  
‘ them this seal. For that reason they went down  
‘ into the water with them, and came up again.  
‘ But these last were alive before they went down :  
‘ but they that died formerly, went down dead, but  
‘ came up again alive. So that it was by the means  
‘ of these, that they received life, and knew the Son  
‘ of God : and accordingly they came up with them,  
‘ and fitted in the building of the tower. And they  
‘ were not hewed, but put in whole, because they  
‘ died in great purity, being full of righteousness :  
‘ only this seal was wanting to them. So you have  
‘ the meaning of these things.’

III. When he says, that ‘ the seal of the Son of  
‘ God is necessary for their entering into the king-  
‘ dom of God ;’ and that ‘ that seal is water,’ it is  
plainly an expression of that sentence or definition  
of our Saviour, which St. John did afterward put  
into writing in these words, *Except a man* (so it  
is in the English, but the original is, *ἐὰν μὴ τις*,  
except one, or except any person) *be born of water  
and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of  
God*<sup>c</sup>.

I say afterward, because this book was written  
before St. John wrote his gospel, as I shall shew.  
And though Hermas here speaks of the apostles  
indefinitely, as being dead ; it is to be understood  
of the major part of them : for St. John was not  
dead.

IV. The passage itself, which represents the pa-  
triarchs and prophets of the Old Testament to stand  
in need of baptism, and of the apostles preaching

<sup>c</sup> John iii. 5.



the name of Christ to them after they were dead, CHAP. I.  
 before they could be capable of entering the king-In the apo-  
 stles' time.  
 dom of God, does indeed seem strange to us, and is  
 the oddest passage in all the book. But we must  
 consider it is represented by way of vision, where  
 every thing is not to be taken in a proper sense :  
 yet Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived about one hun-  
 dred years after this book was written<sup>d</sup>, cites this  
 passage, and takes it for real matter of fact. And  
 those texts, 1 Pet. iii. 19. and iv. 6, which speak of  
*the gospel being preached to them that were dead*,  
 though they be now by most protestants understood  
 in another sense, were by most of the ancients<sup>e</sup> un-  
 derstood in a sense like to this.

This passage does also lead one to think anew of  
 St. Paul's mentioning a practice of some men in  
 those times being *baptized for the dead*<sup>f</sup>. A thing  
 that has never yet been agreed on in what sense it is  
 to be understood. Of the explications that are, I  
 give some account<sup>g</sup> hereafter.

There is, if we compare this passage with those  
 sayings of the apostles, something like, and some-  
 thing unlike. St. Peter mentioning the gospel  
*preached to the dead*, (if he be so to be understood,)  
 makes it to be done by Jesus Christ himself in or by  
 the Spirit : which Hermas represents as done by the  
 apostles after they were dead ; and Clemens Alex-  
 andrinus<sup>h</sup> by both : for he makes Christ to have  
 preached to the deceased just men of the Jewish na-  
 tion ; and the apostles to the deceased heathen men.

<sup>d</sup> Strom. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Iren. lib. v. c. 31. Clem. Alex. Strom. 6. Origen. c. Cels.  
 lib. ii. Tertul. de Anima, c. 7.

<sup>f</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 29.

<sup>g</sup> Chap. xxi. s. iii.

<sup>h</sup> Loc. citat.

**CHAP. I.** St. Paul speaks of some persons baptized for the dead; but Hermas in the way of vision represents the dead themselves that died under the Old Testament, to be baptized in the name of Christ. And Origen<sup>i</sup> speaks much to the same purpose as Hermas.

In the apostles' time.

But whether these were true visions, or only the author's sense given under such a representation, still the scope of the place is to represent the necessity of water-baptism to salvation, or to entrance into the kingdom of God, in the opinion of the then Christians, i. e. the Christians of the apostles' times. Since even they that were dead before the institution of baptism in the name of Christ, are in way of vision represented as incapable of the kingdom of God without it.

*Hermas Pastor*, lib. iii. Similitud. 9. c. 29.

V. He having there spoken of martyrs, confessors, and some other degrees of Christians, comes to speak of a sort of harmless people, represented there by the white colour, who have always been as little children; and adds these words:

‘Quicumque ergo permanserint, inquit, sicut infantes, non habentes malitiam, honoratiores erunt omnibus illis quos jam dixi. Omnes enim infantes honorati sunt apud Dominum, et primi habentur.’

‘Whosoever therefore shall continue as infants, without malice, shall be more honourable than all those of whom I have yet spoken. For all infants are valued by the Lord, and esteemed first of all.’

This being to the same effect as our Saviour's embracing infants, and saying, *Of such is the kingdom of God*, is one of the reasons used to prove

<sup>i</sup> Hom. in Luc. xiv.

that they are fit to be admitted into the covenant of CHAP. I.  
 God's grace and love by baptism. And whereas In the apo-  
 the antipædobaptists expound our Saviour's words, stles' time.  
 not of children themselves, but of men that are of  
 an innocent temper like children: not only that is  
 affirmed here, but it is moreover said of the infants  
 themselves, that they are greatly valued and esteemed  
 of God.

VI. These books of Clement and Hermas, when, after they had in the ignorant age lain hid and unminded, they came again into the hands of learned men, were at first questioned, whether they were the genuine pieces of those authors, and the same that Eusebius<sup>k</sup> testifies to have been reckoned by many for books of holy scripture, and to have been read in many churches accordingly. But after that so many quotations of them by the ancients have been examined, and found to be *verbatim* the same, there is no longer doubt of that matter. They were accounted divinely inspired by some, but rejected from that rank by others. They may therefore very well pass for the two Apocryphal books of the New Testament, as Tobit, &c. are of the Old: and so they are reckoned by Eusebius<sup>l</sup>, Rufinus<sup>m</sup>, &c. The greater commendation is due to the pains of our present most reverend metropolitan<sup>n</sup>, for putting them and some other of the most ancient pieces into the hands of the English reader: and the more

<sup>k</sup> Eccl. Hist. lib. iii. c. 3 et 16.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid.

<sup>m</sup> In Symbolum.

<sup>n</sup> [Archbishop Wake, who published The General Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers, translated, &c. 8vo. 1693: the second edition, corrected and improved, 8vo. 1710; third edit. 1719.]



CHAP. I. preposterous is the humour of many, that prefer the

In the apostles' time. reading of modern things before them.

VII. I said that these books were written before St. John wrote his gospel, which may be made appear thus: St. John lived to sixty-eight years after our Saviour's passion, viz. to the year of Christ 101, as is attested by St. Hierome, who says it in two places<sup>o</sup>, and in one of them says, 'that the church 'histories do most plainly shew it.' And it is certain he cannot be mistaken considerably, because Irenæus, who often recounts how greedily he had in his younger years heard Polycarp discourse of St. John and his affairs, and of the conferences he had had with him, says in several places<sup>p</sup>, 'that St. John 'continued to the times of Trajan;' and the year of Christ 101 is but the third year of Trajan. And it is agreed by all, that he wrote his gospel but a very little before his death.

It is true indeed, that St. John seems, ch. v. 2, to speak of Jerusalem as if it were then standing. But many learned men understand these words, *There is at Jerusalem, &c.*, that is, in the place where Jerusalem was, or in the ruins; as if one had said during the ruins of London, *There is in Cheapside a conduit.*

The current tradition is, that he wrote it upon his return to Ephesus, after that violent persecution of Christians in the fourteenth year of Domitian, anno Dom. 94, remembered by all writers. In that persecution St. John was banished into the island Patmos, *for the word of God, and for the testi-*

<sup>o</sup> De Script. Eccl. et lib. i. contra Jovinian.

<sup>p</sup> Lib. ii. c. 39. et lib. iii. c. 3.

*mony of Jesus Christ*<sup>q</sup>: where he had that vision or CHAP. I.  
 Revelation which he has published, which Irenæus In the apo-  
 stles' time.  
 shews to have been in the latter end of Domitian's  
 reign in these words: 'We will not run the hazard of  
 ' affirming any thing positively concerning the name  
 ' of Antichrist,' signified by the number 666; 'for if  
 ' it had been expedient to be published plainly at  
 ' present, it would have been expressed by him him-  
 ' self that saw the vision: since it is not very long  
 ' ago that it was seen; being but a little before our  
 ' time, at the latter end of Domitian's reign<sup>r</sup>.'

Domitian dying anno 96, and Nerva, a mild  
 prince, succeeding, the prisoners and banished men  
 were released: and St. John returned to Ephesus,  
 where, as Irenæus<sup>s</sup> and Athanasius<sup>t</sup> testify, he  
 wrote his gospel. And St. Hierome mentions the  
 occasion of it<sup>u</sup>; 'He, last of all the rest, wrote his  
 ' gospel, being entreated so to do by the bishops of  
 ' Asia, against Cerinthus and other heretics, and espe-  
 ' cially the then new sprung up opinion of the Ebion-  
 ' ites, who affirm, that Christ had no being before  
 ' Mary; for which reason he thought it needful to  
 ' discourse concerning his divine nativity also.' And  
 this is, as to the main, confirmed out of Irenæus  
 himself; for he says that 'he wrote it at Ephesus<sup>x</sup>:'  
 and, that 'he aimed thereby to extirpate the error  
 ' which had been sowed in the minds of men by  
 ' Cerinthus<sup>y</sup>.' These things are reported by such  
 men as had the opportunity of easily knowing the  
 truth in such matters of fact.

Now for the age of these books of Clement and

<sup>q</sup> Rev. i. 9.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. v. c. 30.

<sup>s</sup> Lib. iii. c. 1.

<sup>t</sup> In Synopsi.

<sup>u</sup> De Script. Eccl. v. Joan.

<sup>x</sup> Lib. iii. c. 1.

<sup>y</sup> Lib. iii. c. 11.

CHAP. I. Hermas, one need only inquire for the time Clement's death : for Hermas wrote his while Clement was living and bishop of the church at Rome, and mentions him therein as such<sup>z</sup>. And though the time of Clement's death be not so exactly to be discovered from the ancients, but that they that have gone about to settle it have varied ; and some from others twenty years : yet they that have placed it the latest, have placed it as soon as St. John's death is placed by those that have placed that the soonest, viz. anno 101 : for in giving that date of St. John's death, I gave the earliest that is pitched upon. St. Chrysostom and the Chronicon Alexandr. make him live some years longer.

In the apostles' time.

The two that of late have made the most exact disquisition about the time of St. Clement, are bishop Pearson and Mr. Dodwell. Bishop Pearson<sup>a</sup> having found by undeniable proofs that the times of Hyginus, bishop of Rome, are set too low in the chronological tables by fifteen or twenty, or (as some writers place him) thirty years, and that he must have entered upon his office anno 122 at the latest, does proportionably set all the foregoing bishops higher : and so he has made St. Clement come into the bishopric immediately after the death of St. Peter and St. Paul, which he place sanno 68, (thirty-five years after our Saviour's passion,) and to continue alive till the year 83. And he supposes Linus and Anencletus, who are commonly placed before St. Clement, to have been no otherwise bishops there, than as they acted under the said apostles in their lifetime.

<sup>z</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 2. c. 4.

<sup>a</sup> Pearsoni Opera posthuma Chronolog. Dissert. ii.



Mr. Dodwell<sup>b</sup> judges that after the said apostle's death, which he places anno 64, Linus was bishop, and after him Anencletus. But that they both died in a very short time, about a year; and that Clement succeeded anno 65, and continued to 81. By either of these accounts Clement was dead a great while before St. John had wrote any of his books.

VIII. But there is a passage in Irenæus (whose authority every one owns to be in this matter beyond compare) wherein the time of Clement's succession, and the distance thereof from the time of those apostles, is purposely insisted on: and that though it mention not the years, yet as it supposes his entry on that office to be nigher St. Peter and St. Paul's time than some had placed it, so it will by no means suffer him to be placed so early, as to succeed within a year or two after their death. It is lib. iii. c. 3, where he is confuting that plea of the Valentinians, (heretics that held that there is another God, superior to him that created the world,) whereby they pretended to have this doctrine by tradition from the apostles; who would not write it, nor tell it to every body, but to some more perfect disciples, by whose hands it came to them. The words are these;

‘ It is easy for any one that would be guided by  
‘ truth, to know the tradition of the apostles, de-  
‘ clared in all the world. And we are able to reckon  
‘ up those that were placed bishops by the apostles in  
‘ the several churches, and their successors, to this  
‘ time; who never taught nor knew any such thing  
‘ as these men dream of. Now the apostles, if they

<sup>b</sup> Dissertatio sing. de Success. Rom. Pont. c. 11, 12, &c.

CHAP. I. ' had known of any deep mysteries which they  
 In the apo- ' would communicate to those that were perfect,  
 stles' time. ' privately and by themselves, would have taught  
 ' them to those men sooner than any, to whom they  
 ' committed the churches: for they desired that  
 ' such should be very perfect in every thing, and  
 ' wanting in nothing; whom they left as their suc-  
 ' cessors, delivering to them their own place of go-  
 ' vernment. Since, if these men did well, there  
 ' would ensue great advantage; but if they mis-  
 ' carried, great mischief.

' But it being a long business in such a book  
 ' as this, to reckon up the successions of all the  
 ' churches: if we shew the tradition left by the  
 ' apostles, and the faith taught the Christians de-  
 ' rived by successions of bishops to our time, in that  
 ' church which is one of the greatest and most an-  
 ' cient, and known to every body, founded and built  
 ' by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul;  
 ' we shall shame all those who by self-conceit or  
 ' vainglory, or by ignorance and mistaken opinion,  
 ' hold things that they ought not. For every church,  
 ' I mean the Christians of all places round about,  
 ' have necessary occasions to come to this church,  
 ' by reason that the government and power is there,  
 ' (meaning the seat of the empire,) and so in this  
 ' church the tradition of the apostles is always  
 ' preserved, by means of those that from all places  
 ' resort thither.

' The blessed apostles, then, having founded and  
 ' built this church, delivered over to Linus the office  
 ' of the bishopric. This Linus, Paul mentions in  
 ' his Epistles to Timothy<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> 2 Tim. iv. 21.

‘ The next to him is Anencletus.

‘ After him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement comes into the bishopric, who had both seen the blessed apostles and conferred with them, and had the preaching and tradition of the apostles as yet sounding in his ears ; and that, not he alone ; for there were many then left alive who had been personally taught by the apostles. It was under this Clement that a great dissension happening among the brethren that were at Corinth, the church that was at Rome sent a most powerful epistle to the Corinthians, persuading them to peace, stirring up their faith anew, and declaring to them the tradition which they had lately received from the apostles, which teaches, that there is but one God Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, creator of man, &c.—And that the same God is declared by the churches to be the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whoso will may see, *ex ipsa scriptura*, by that scripture (or writing) itself, and may understand the apostolical tradition of the church : for that epistle is older than they are that now teach these false doctrines, and invent another God above the Creator and Maker of the things that are seen.’ He proceeds to name the bishops from Clement to Eleutherus, who was then bishop, the twelfth from the apostles ; and to appeal to the church of Smyrna, which had had Polycarp : and to the church of Ephesus, which had had St. John so lately living among them ; and that none of these had taught or pretended to know of any of those secret traditions that these men set up.

Now, when it was for his purpose to shew how near Clement and this epistle of his were to the

In the apostles' time.



CHAP. I. times of St. Peter and St. Paul, and he says no more, but that Clement had seen and heard them, and that several others were then alive beside him, that had done the like; he plainly supposes that they had been dead a considerable time. For we never speak so of men that have been dead but a year or two. When we say, ‘There are many yet alive that can remember such a man, and have conversed with him;’ a stander by will conclude we speak of one that has been dead a good while; it may be fifteen or twenty years. And yet even so, if we reckon with Eusebius<sup>d</sup> and other ancient accounts, that Clement held the seat but nine years, he will yet die before St. John, and before the time when, by all accounts, he wrote his gospel.

In the apostles’ time.

This also is considerable; that Clement, who quotes many places out of other books of the New Testament, seems never to have seen any of St. John’s writings.

Therefore, though bishop Pearson has convinced every body that Hyginus is to be placed as he has placed him; yet it seems improbable that Clement should have been bishop so soon as he places him. Rather, some years are to be taken from the times of the bishops that were between those two.

IX. For the same reason, I think it very improbable that this Clement was the Clement mentioned, Phil. iv. 3, as St. Paul’s fellow labourer, when he was at Rome the first time, six years before his martyrdom; though Eusebius<sup>e</sup>, St Jerome<sup>f</sup>, and Epiphanius do guess him to be the same. For would not Irenæus have mentioned that, instead of

<sup>d</sup> Chronic. it. Hist. lib. iii. c. 34.

<sup>e</sup> H. E. lib. iii. c. 12.

<sup>f</sup> De Script. Eccl. v. Clemens.

saying what he does? It was much more to his CHAP. I.  
purpose, than to observe the like of Linus, of whose In the apo-  
stles' time.  
authority he makes no such use.

And more improbable it is, that this Hermas should be the same whom St. Paul salutes as his acquaintance eleven years before he died, Rom. xvi. 14, though Origen<sup>g</sup> guess it to be he; and Eusebius<sup>h</sup> and St. Jerome<sup>i</sup> tell us that several thought so. For this Hermas, as he was no young man, because he had children<sup>k</sup> then guilty of fornication, so he was no very old man when he wrote; because he mentions the woman<sup>l</sup> that had been brought up with him, as a woman of such great beauty at that time. To conclude men to be the same, because of the same name, as it is very obvious, so it is of little weight.

And if they be not judged to be the same, nor to have had any such familiarity with the apostles, but only to have seen or heard them, &c., then that argument falls to the ground of those that say, These books are either spurious, and then, Why do we regard them? Or else, if they be counted genuine, why are they not put into the canon, as well as the writings of St. Luke and St. Mark? St. Mark and St. Luke were for certain contemporaries, companions, and intimate acquaintance with the apostles for a long time of their life; the same is not certain, and I believe not true of the authors of these books; though it be plain that they lived in the apostles' age, and wrote before the death of St. John.

<sup>g</sup> Hom. in Rom. xvi.  
Eccl. v. Hermas.

<sup>h</sup> Lib. iii. c. 3.

<sup>i</sup> De Script.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 2. c. 2.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. i. Vis. 1.

## CHAP. II.

*Quotations out of Justin Martyr.**Dialog. cum Tryphone, sect. 88.*

CHAP. II.

Year after  
the apo-  
stles. 40.  
A. D. 140.

§. I. ΚΑΙ οὐχ' ὡς ἐνδεᾶ αὐτὸν τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, ἢ τοῦ ἐπελθόντος ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς πνεύματος, οἶδαμεν αὐτὸν ἐληλυθέναι ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν· ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὸ γεννηθῆναι αὐτὸν καὶ σταυρωθῆναι ὡς ἐνδεῆς τούτων ὑπέμεινεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ γένους τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὃ ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑπὸ θάνατον καὶ πλάνην τὴν τοῦ Ὁφείως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὴν ἰδίαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστου αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένου.

‘ And we know that he did not go to Jordan, as  
‘ having any need of being baptized, or of the  
‘ Spirit’s coming on him in shape of a dove. As  
‘ also, neither did he submit to be born and to be  
‘ crucified, as being under any necessity of those  
‘ things. But he did this for mankind, which by  
‘ Adam was fallen under death, and under the guile  
‘ of the serpent, beside the peculiar guilt of each of  
‘ them who had sinned.’

I recite this only to shew that in these times, so very near the apostles, they spoke of original sin affecting all mankind descended of Adam; and understood, that, besides the actual sins of each particular person, there is in our nature itself, since the fall, something that needs redemption and forgiveness by the merits of Christ. And that is ordinarily applied to every particular person by baptism. In answer to the exceptions made against my translating *παρὰ* here by *præter*, I have, in a Defence which I have been forced to write since the second edition, shewn that all whom I have seen, and I believe absolutely all, who have translated this place, have so



rendered it. And that Justin's ordinary phrase, CHAP. II.  
and particularly in this dialogue, is to use it so.

*Dialog. cum Tryphone, sect. 43.*

<sup>40.</sup>  
(A.D. 140.)

II. Καὶ ἡμεῖς, οἱ διὰ τούτου προσχωρήσαντες τῷ Θεῷ,  
οὐ ταύτην τὴν κατὰ σάρκα παρελάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ  
πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν· ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ  
τοῦ βαπτίσματος αὐτήν, ἐπειδὴ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγεγόνημεν,  
διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐλάβομεν· καὶ πᾶσιν  
ἐφετὸν ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν.

‘ We also who by him have had access to God,  
‘ have not received this carnal circumcision, but the  
‘ spiritual circumcision, which Enoch, and those like  
‘ him observed. And we have received it by bap-  
‘ tism, by the mercy of God, because we were sin-  
‘ ners; and it is allowed to all persons to receive it  
‘ by the same way.’

It is plain that this most ancient father does here speak of baptism being to Christians in the stead of circumcision; and the analogy between these two is one of the arguments used by the pædobaptists to prove that one ought to be given to infants, as well as the other was. It is to the same sense, as is that saying of St. Paul, where he calls baptism, with the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, which attends it, *the circumcision of Christ*, (or as it would be more intelligibly rendered, the Christian circumcision,) in these words: *In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism<sup>m</sup>.* For by those words, *the circumcision of Christ*, must be understood either that action by which Christ himself in his infancy was circumcised; and

<sup>m</sup> Col. ii. 11, 12.

CHAP. II. <sup>40.</sup> it is no sense to say, that the Colossians were circumcised with that; or else, that circumcision which (A.D. 140.) Christ has appointed, the Christian circumcision; and with that he says they were circumcised, being buried with him by baptism. Only he, as well as Justin, refers both to the inward and outward part of baptism; whereof the inward part is done without hands: and accordingly the ancients were wont to call baptism, περιτομήν ἀχειροποιήτον, ‘the circumcision done without hands;’ as will appear by some following quotations<sup>n</sup>. So that it seems hard for the antipædobaptists to maintain, as some of them do, that the scripture and ancient Christians do not make any resemblance between these two sacraments.

The paraphrase given of this text of St. Paul, in the Quæst. ad Orthodox. ascribed to Justin Martyr, q. 102, is this: the question there is, ‘Why, if ‘circumcision were a good thing, we do not use it ‘as well as the Jews did?’ The answer is, ‘We are ‘circumcised by baptism with Christ’s circumcision,’ &c. And he brings this text for his proof.

*Justini Apologia prima (vulgo secunda) ad Antoninum Pium<sup>o</sup>.*

III. This holy man and good martyr of Jesus Christ does in this Apology, presented to the emperor and senate in behalf of the Christians, vindicate them from the absurd and abominable slanders which the people raised on them; as that they did in their assemblies eat young children, and commit promiscuous fornication, &c. And having spoke of their doctrine and conversation, and shewn that they

<sup>n</sup> See ch. xii. s. iii. ch. xiv. s. i.

<sup>o</sup> Prope finem.

neither believed nor practised any such mischievous things as were reported, he proceeds to speak of the two most solemn rites that they used, viz. of initiating

CHAP. II.

40.  
(A.D. 140.)

or entering the converts that came to them by baptism; and of confirming their faith by receiving the Lord's Supper. And of baptism says thus: "Ὁν τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ Θεῷ, καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν πονηρεῦν τι ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. "Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσιν ἀληθῇ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα, εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὐχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. "Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστὶ, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀναγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται. 'Ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ Δεσπότης Θεοῦ, καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν, \*Ἄν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῇτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερόν πᾶσιν ἐστὶ. Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ Προφήτου, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἴρηται, τίνα τρόπον φεύξονται τὰς ἁμαρτίας οἱ ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ μετανοοῦντες, ἐλέχθη δὲ οὕτως, Λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένεσθε, &c.—Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον· ἐπειδὴ τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν ἡμῶν ἀγνοοῦντες κατ' ἀνάγκην γεγεννήμεθα ἐξ ὑγρᾶς σπορᾶς κατὰ μίξιν τὴν τῶν γονέων κατ' ἀλλήλους, καὶ ἐν ἔθεσι φαύλοις καὶ πονηραῖς ἀνατροφαῖς γεγόναμεν, ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μὴδ' ἀγνοίας μένωμεν, ἀλλὰ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἀφέσεώς τε ἁμαρτιῶν ὑπὲρ ὧν προημάρτομεν τύχωμεν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, ἐπονομάζεται τῷ ἐλομένῳ ἀναγεννηθῆναι καὶ μετανοήσαντι ἐπὶ τοῖς ἡμαρτημένοις τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ



CHAP. II. Δεσπότου Θεοῦ ὄνομα, &c. Καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λουτρὸν  
 40. φωτισμός<sup>p</sup>.

(A.D. 140.) ‘ I will now declare to you also after what manner  
 ‘ we being made new by Christ [or baptized] have  
 ‘ dedicated ourselves to God : lest, if I should leave  
 ‘ out that, I might seem to deal unfairly in some  
 ‘ part of my apology. They who are persuaded and  
 ‘ do believe that those things which are taught by  
 ‘ us are true, and do promise to live according to  
 ‘ them, are directed first to pray and ask of God  
 ‘ with fasting, the forgiveness of their former sins :  
 ‘ and we also pray and fast together with them.  
 ‘ Then we bring them to some place where there is  
 ‘ water ; and they are regenerated by the same way  
 ‘ of regeneration by which we were regenerated :  
 ‘ for they are washed with water in the name of  
 ‘ God, the Father and Lord of all things, and of our  
 ‘ Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For  
 ‘ Christ says, *Unless ye be regenerated, ye cannot enter*  
 ‘ *into the kingdom of heaven*<sup>q</sup> : and every body knows  
 ‘ it is impossible for those that are once generated [or  
 ‘ born] to enter again into their mother’s womb.

‘ It was foretold by the prophet Isaiah<sup>r</sup>, as I said,  
 ‘ by what means they who would repent of their  
 ‘ sins might escape them : and was written in these  
 ‘ words ; *Wash you, make you clean, put away the*  
 ‘ *evil*, &c.

‘ And we have been taught by the apostles this  
 ‘ word [or this reason] for this thing : because we,  
 ‘ being ignorant of our first birth, were generated  
 ‘ by necessity [or course of nature] of the humid  
 ‘ seed of our parents mixing together, and have  
 ‘ been brought up in ill customs and conversation ;

<sup>p</sup> Apol. I. s. 61.

<sup>q</sup> John iii. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Isa. i. 16.

‘ that we should not continue children of that ne-  
 ‘ cessity and ignorance, but of will, [or choice,] and  
 ‘ knowledge, and should obtain forgiveness of the  
 ‘ sins in which we have lived, by water, [or in the  
 ‘ water.] There is invoked, over him that has a  
 ‘ mind to be regenerated, the name of God, the Fa-  
 ‘ ther and Lord of all things, &c.—And this wash-  
 ‘ ing is called *the enlightening*,’ &c.

If I am asked to what purpose I bring in this in a discourse of infant baptism; my answer is, that I do not produce it as making directly or immediately either for or against it. He being here to shew that the ceremony of entering proselytes that came to them from the heathens, had no ill thing in it, had no occasion to speak of the case of infants. But I bring it,

1. Because it is the most ancient account of the way of baptizing, next the scripture; and shews the plain and simple manner of administering it. The Christians of these times had lived, many of them at least, in the apostles’ days.

IV. 2. Because it shews that the Christians of these times used the word *regeneration* [or being born again] for baptism: and that they were taught so to do by the apostles. And it will appear by the multitude of places I shall produce, that they used it as customarily, and appropriated it as much to signify baptism, as we do the word *christening*. They used also ἀνακαινισμός or καινοποιῖα, ‘renewing,’ and φωτισμός, ‘enlightening,’ for the same thing: as appears by the first and last words of this passage.

And thirdly, because we see by it, that they understood that rule of our Saviour, *Except one be regenerated* [or born again] *of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, of water-

CHAP. II.

40.

(A.D. 140.)

CHAP. II. baptism; and concluded from it, that without such  
<sup>40.</sup>  
 (A.D. 140.) baptism, no person could come to heaven. And so  
 did all the writers of these 400 years, not one man  
 excepted.

V. This is of the more use to note, because many modern writers use the word *regeneration*, or *new-birth*, for repentance and conversion, whether it be accompanied with baptism at that time or not. But the ancients do not so. The scripture also uses it for baptism: *The washing of regeneration*, Tit. iii. 5, is the washing of baptism.

And I shewed before in the introduction, that this phrase was not first used by our Saviour or his apostles: but that it was a usual word of the Jews, to denote that baptism by which any proselyte was baptized unto Moses.

*Justin Martyr, Apol. 1. (vulgo 2da) prope ab initio.*

VI. Καὶ πολλοὶ τινες καὶ πολλαὶ ἐξηκοντούται καὶ ἐβδομηκοντούται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένουσι. ‘Several persons among us of sixty  
 ‘ and seventy years old, of both sexes, who were disci-  
 ‘ pled [or made disciples] to Christ in, or from their  
 ‘ childhood, do continue uncorrupted [or virgins.]’

St. Justin’s word, ἐμαθητεύθησαν, ‘were discipled, or  
 ‘ made disciples,’ is the very same word that had been used by St. Matthew in expressing our Saviour’s command, μαθητεύσατε, *disciple* [or, make disciples] *all the nations*. And it was done to these persons, Justin says, in or from their childhood. So that whereas the antipædobaptists do say, that when our Saviour bids the apostles *disciple the nations, baptizing them*; he cannot mean infants; because he must be understood to bid them baptize only such among the nations as could be



made disciples; and infants, they say, cannot be made disciples. They may perceive that in the sense in which Justin understood the word, they may be made disciples. And Justin wrote but ninety years after St. Matthew, who wrote about fifteen years after Christ's ascension. And they that were seventy years old at this time must have been made disciples to Christ in their childhood, (as he says they were,) about thirty-six years after the ascension; that is, in the midst of the apostles' times, and within twenty years after St. Matthew's writing.

---

### CHAP. III.

*Quotations out of St. Irenæus and Clemens Alexandrinus.*

§. I. IRENÆUS does in many places speak of original sin, as affecting 'all mankind<sup>a</sup>,' all our 'race<sup>b</sup>,' putting them in a state of 'debtors to God,' 'transgressors, and enemies to him<sup>c</sup>,' 'under the 'stroke of the serpent, and addicted to death<sup>d</sup>.' And that it is only in and through Christ that they have 'reconciliation and redemption<sup>e</sup>.' He also so speaks of baptism, as of the means or instrument by which this redemption is conveyed and applied to any one, and calls it by the name of *λύτρωσις* and *ἀπολύτρωσις*, 'redemption<sup>f</sup>.'

But though this laid together do make an argument for the baptizing all persons, infants as well as others, yet I shall pass by this and other such

<sup>a</sup> Lib. contra Hær. v. c. 19.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. c. 21.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. c. 16.

<sup>d</sup> Lib. iv. c. 5. et lib. v. c. 19.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. iii. c. 20.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. i. c. 18.

CHAP. III. places in this and other authors, that speak of original sin, and the necessity of baptism only in general: intending henceforward to recite such only as do more directly and immediately concern infants, and speak of their baptism; either for or against it. *Irenæus adv. Hæreses*, lib. ii. c. 39. (edit. Grabe; but cap. 22. s. 4. in ed. Benedict. 1710.) speaking of Christ.

II. ‘Magister ergo existens Magistri quoque habebat ætatem. Non reprobans nec supergrediens hominem, neque solvens [suam] legem in se humani generis: sed omnem ætatem sanctificans per illam quæ ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semet ipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum; infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit ætatem: et infantibus infans factus, sanctificans infantes: in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem; simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus, et justificationis: in juvenibus juvenis,’ &c.

‘Therefore as he was a Master, he had also the age of a Master. Not disdaining nor going in a way above human nature; nor breaking in his own person the law which he had set for mankind: but sanctifying every several age by the likeness that it has to him. For he came to save all persons by himself: all, I mean, who by him are regenerated [or baptized] unto God; infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he went through the several ages: for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants: to little ones he was made a little one, sanctifying those of that age; and also giving

‘ them an example of godliness, justice, and dutiful-  
 ‘ ness: to youths he was a youth,’ &c. CHAP. III.

This testimony, which reckons infants among <sup>67.</sup> (A D. 167.) those that are regenerated, is plain and full; provided the reader be one that is satisfied that the word *regeneration* does, in the usual phrase of those times, signify baptism: and this cannot be doubted by any that are at all acquainted with the books of those ages. As for those that are not, I have already had occasion to refer<sup>g</sup> them to the use of the Jews before and in Christ’s time, and to some places of scripture: and it may be worth the while to turn back to the passage of Justin Martyr last quoted, (he lived but thirty or forty years before this man,) and to observe how he uses the word. The reader will also see, in almost all the passages that I shall have occasion to produce, the same use of the word constantly observed; that to say *regenerated* is with them as much as to say *baptized*.

III. At present take these three evidences of it:  
 1. Irenæus himself uses it so in all other places of his book that I have ever observed: as for instance, l. iii. c. 19, [c. 17. 1.] where he is producing testimonies of scripture concerning the Holy Spirit, he has this; ‘ Et iterum, potestatem regenerationis in  
 ‘ Deum dans discipulis, dicebat eis,’ &c. And again, when he gave his disciples the commission of regenerating unto God, he said unto them, *Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*. Where the commission of regenerating plainly means the commission of baptizing.

And l. i. c. 18. [c. 21. 1.] Concerning the Valentinian



CHAP. III. heretics, who altered and corrupted both the form of  
 67.  
 (A.D. 167.) Christian baptism and the manner of administering  
 it, (of which corruptions I have occasion to speak  
 particularly hereafter, chap. xxi. s. ii. and part ii.  
 ch. v. s. i.) he says,

Εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεν-  
 νήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν, ὑποβέβληται τὸ  
 εἶδος τοῦτο ὑπὸ τοῦ Σατανᾶ. ‘This generation of  
 ‘ heretics has been sent out by Satan for the frustrat-  
 ‘ ing [or denying] of the baptism of regeneration  
 ‘ unto God, [i. e. the true Christian baptism, instead  
 ‘ of which they set up a mock baptism of their own,]  
 ‘ and the destruction of our whole faith [or religion].’  
 And it appears by the following parts of the chapter,  
 that the Valentinians also aped the Christians in  
 calling their mock-baptism by the name of regene-  
 ration and redemption, λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν  
 εἶναι——ἵνα εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα Δύναμιν ᾧσιν ἀναγεγεν-  
 νημένοι. ‘They say that it [their way of baptism] is  
 necessary for all true Gnostics, that they may be  
 ‘ regenerated unto that power which is above all,  
 ‘ i. e. above the God of the Christians.’

And l. v. c. 15. [c. 15. 3.] speaking of the blind man  
 whom our Saviour cured by clay and spittle, and bade  
 him wash in the pool of Siloam; and calling this ap-  
 plication of clay, and this washing, in an allegorical  
 way, a creation, or new formation of his eye; and a  
 baptism; he styles that washing, *lavacrum regene-  
 rationis*, ‘the washing of regeneration.’ And a little  
 after, ‘Simul et plasmationem et eam quæ est per  
 ‘ lavacrum regenerationem restituens ei.’ ‘He gave  
 ‘ to him at the same time his formation [viz. that of  
 ‘ his eye] and that regeneration which is by the  
 ‘ laver [viz. baptism.]’

And l. iv. c. 59. [c. 33. 4.] disputing against the Ebionites, (who denied our Saviour to have been conceived in the womb in any miraculous manner, but thought him to have been begotten by Joseph in the ordinary way,) he asks them, how they think to escape the generation of death, [or the curse attending the natural generation,] if they do not believe that new way of generation which was foretold to Ahaz, (*Behold, a virgin shall conceive,*) and so ‘eam recipiant quæ est per fidem regenerationem,’ ‘receive that regeneration [or baptism] which is by the faith [or creed]?’

This place is mangled in the old copy. And Dr. Grabe<sup>h</sup> shews that the sense requires the words *eam recipiant quæ est* to be restored in the blank. And it is to be noted that the ancient creeds always had that clause, of the conception of a virgin, in opposition to these Ebionites. And a common name for the creed was (as Mr. Bingham shews) Πίστις, ‘the faith.’ According to which faith Irenæus advises the Ebionites to receive their baptism.

As the ancients, when they speak of regeneration as applied to a person in this world, do always by that word mean, or connote, his baptism; so when they speak of the regeneration of the world itself, or the earth, they mean its restitution or renovation after the day of judgment; which may be called its new birth, or new formation. And in that metaphorical way of speaking, they sometimes call the resurrection of the body its regeneration. So there is one place in Irenæus, lib. v. c. 2, where, by the regeneration of the flesh, one does not know whether he mean the baptism of it in this world, or its

<sup>h</sup> [Compare the note of the Benedictine editor on this point.]

CHAP. III. resurrection in the world to come. He is there disputing against the Valentinians, and all those sorts  
 67.  
 (A.D. 167.) of heretics who denied either the truth of Christ's natural body and its resurrection, or the resurrection of ours; and says, 'Vani autem omnimodo, qui  
 ' universam dispositionem Dei contemnunt, et carnis  
 ' salutem negant, et regenerationem ejus spernunt;  
 ' dicentes non eam capacem esse incorruptibilitatis.'  
 ' They are altogether vain, who undervalue the  
 ' whole economy of God, and deny any salvation of  
 ' the flesh [or body] and do slight the regeneration  
 ' of it; saying that it is not capable of a state of  
 ' incorruption.'

By their slighting the regeneration of the flesh, he must mean either their denying its resurrection, as many of them did; or else their refusing to give it baptism; which several sects of the Valentinians did, who are mentioned by Irenæus at other places which I recite, part ii. ch. 5. §. i. By his making two sentences of it, his meaning seems to be, that they, not believing any resurrection of the body, but that the soul is all that survives, did not think the body worthy of a baptism.

These, and one piece more, are all that I know of, where he uses the word: lib. iii. c. 33. [c. 22. §. 4.] He is speaking of Christ, at his descent to Hades, freeing the patriarchs from that power of death, or Hades, under which they had been held: and says, 'Primogenitus enim mortuorum natus Dominus, et  
 ' in sinum suum recipiens pristinos patres, regene-  
 ' ravit eos in vitam Dei.' 'Our Lord being made the  
 ' first begotten from the dead, and receiving the an-  
 ' cient patriarchs into his bosom, regenerated them  
 ' to the life of God.'—And a little after; 'Hic illos



‘ in evangelium vitæ regeneravit. ‘ He regenerated CHAP. III.  
 ‘ them to the gospel of life.’

These phrases at this place, he means, I think, as 67.  
(A.D. 167.)  
 a comment on those texts of St. Peter; *He went and preached to the spirits in prison: and, the gospel preached to those that were dead.* For that he understood them so, is plain by what he says, lib. iv. c. 45. [c. 27. §. 2.] ‘ Dominum in ea quæ sunt ‘ sub terra descendisse, evangelizantem et illis adventum suum,’ &c. Many of the eldest Christians (beside Hermas, whose words I gave before) conceived, that the gospel of life was preached, and baptism in the name of Christ given to the patriarchs in their separate state.

But however that be; in all the places where he uses the word *regeneration*, as applied to the case of any persons in this life, he refers to their baptism. Which confirms that sense of it in the place I first quoted.

IV. 2. There are several sayings both of the Latin and Greek fathers, which do plainly shew that they not only used that word for baptism, but also that they so appropriated it to baptism, as to exclude any other conversion or repentance that is not accompanied with baptism, from being signified by it. As these that follow:

Greg. Nazianzen, when he deters the baptized person from falling back into sinful courses, tells him<sup>i</sup>, ‘ There is not another regeneration afterward ‘ to be had, though it be sought with never so much ‘ crying and tears:’ and yet grants in the next words, that there is repentance after baptism: but

<sup>i</sup> Orat. 40. prope ab initio. Οὐκ οὔσης δευτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως.

CHAP. III. shews a difference between that and the free forgiveness given in baptism.

<sup>67.</sup>  
(A.D. 167.)  
<sup>300.</sup> St. Austin being asked, whether a parent carrying his child, which had been baptized, to the heathen sacrifices, do thereby obliterate the benefit of his baptism<sup>k</sup>, gives this rule: ‘An infant does never lose ‘the grace of Christ which he has once received, but ‘by his own sinful deeds, if when he grows up ‘he prove so wicked, for then he will begin to ‘have sins of his own, *quæ non regeneratione auferantur, sed alia curatione sanentur*, which are ‘not to be done away by regeneration, but by some ‘other way of cure.’ These kind of sayings do plainly contradistinguish regeneration from repentance, conversion, &c. except in case of baptism.

270. So St. Hierome, discoursing in praise of virginity, has this<sup>l</sup> among the rest, that Christ was ‘natus ex ‘virgine, renatus per virginem,’ ‘born of a virgin, and ‘regenerated by a virgin;’ meaning he was baptized by John, that was unmarried. To say that Christ was regenerated, taking the word, as many modern writers do, for conversion, repentance, &c. would be an impious speech.

And St. Ambrose, *De iis qui initiantur*, c. 4. says<sup>m</sup>, ‘Nec sine aqua regenerationis mysterium est,’ ‘There ‘is no regeneration without water.’

St. Austin calls the persons by whose means infants are baptized, ‘eos per quos renascuntur,’ ‘those ‘by whom they are regenerated,’ which would be a strange speech in the dialect of some late English

<sup>k</sup> Epist. 23. ad Bonifacium.

<sup>l</sup> Lib. i. contra Jovinian. circa medium.

<sup>m</sup> [Or. De Mysteriis; vol. ii. p. 325. ed. Benedict.]

writers, who use the word for the conversion of the heart. CHAP. III.

V. 3. When Irenæus does here speak of infants <sup>67.</sup> (A.D. 167.) regenerated; it is plain enough of itself, that they are not capable of regeneration in any other sense of the word, than as it signifies baptism; I mean the outward act of baptism, accompanied with that grace or mercy of God, whereby he admits them into covenant, though without any sense of theirs.

I shall in the places that I must cite henceforward, where we meet with the word *regeneratus*, *renatus*, &c., translate it *regenerated*, without any further explication; but the reader will find that he must understand by it *baptized*; or else that he will make no sense at all of the place. If any one doubt whether Irenæus by infants does mean children before the use of reason, I refer to the Defence of my book against Mr. Gale and Mr. Whiston, who have suggested the contrary, and do here only advise the following words to be read, where he mentions the benefit of Christ's example to all the rest, the *parvuli*, the *juvenes*, and the *seniores*, but says no such thing of the infants.

VI. Since this is the first express mention that we have met with of infants baptized, it is worth the while to look back, and consider how near this man was to the apostles' time. Mr. Dodwell, who has with the greatest care and skill computed his age<sup>u</sup>, makes him to be born in the apostolic age, viz. the year after Christ's birth 97, four years before St. John died; and that he was chosen bishop of Lyons anno Dom. 167, which is after the apostles 67. His proofs are too long to repeat here. So much is plain,

<sup>u</sup> Dissertationes ad Irenæum, 8vo. Oxoniæ, 1689.



CHAP. III. that he wrote the book I here quote within eighty  
 67.  
 (A.D. 167.) years after the apostles, and that he was then a very  
 old man. For he wrote the two first of his five  
 books against heresies first, and published them<sup>o</sup>,  
 in which these words are; and he published his  
 third book in the time of Eleutherus, bishop of  
 Rome, for he mentions him as then bishop<sup>p</sup>. Eleu-  
 therus's time is set by bishop Pearson<sup>q</sup> from the year  
 of Christ 170 to 185; but by Mr. Dodwell<sup>r</sup> from  
 162 to 177. So that the year of Christ 180 is the  
 latest that the two first books can well be supposed  
 to have been written. Therefore whether we agree  
 or not with Mr. Dodwell, that he was born before  
 St. John's death; yet it could be but very little after,  
 by the age he must be of when he wrote. And be-  
 sides, he himself says<sup>s</sup>, as I also recited before, that  
 the Revelation made to St. John in Patmos, was 'but  
 'a little before his time,' and that Revelation was  
 five or six years before St. John died. The learned  
 man<sup>t</sup> that has given the last edition of his works,  
 though he differ from Mr. Dodwell, yet makes him  
 born but six years after St. John's death. Every  
 body that was at this time eighty years old must  
 have been born in the apostles' time. Irenæus's  
 parents must have been born then, if he were not  
 himself.

I shall say no more, but leave it to every body to

<sup>o</sup> Vide Prolog. lib. iii.

<sup>p</sup> Ibid. c. 3.

<sup>q</sup> Pearsoni Opera Posthuma, 4to. Londini, 1688.

<sup>r</sup> Dissert. sing. de Rom. Pontif. Successione, c. 14 et 15.  
 [This dissertation of Dodwell is subjoined to Bishop Pearson's  
 Opera Posthuma.]

<sup>s</sup> Lib. v. c. 30.

<sup>t</sup> [Dr. Grabe; for the Benedictine edition had not appeared  
 in 1705, the year in which this was printed.]

judge whether it were possible for the church then CHAP. III.  
 to be ignorant what was done as to the baptizing of 92.  
(A.D. 192.)  
 infants in the apostles' time; when many then  
 living, and the parents of most then living, were  
 themselves infants in that time. Yet this I may  
 add, that Irenæus, though at this time he lived in  
 France, being bishop of Lyons, yet was brought up  
 in Asia, (where St. John had died but a little before,)  
 and probably born of Christian parents. For he  
 had in his younger years often heard Polycarp (who  
 was St. John's acquaintance, and was<sup>s</sup> chosen by  
 him bishop of Smyrna, and was probably that *angel*  
 [or bishop] of the church of Smyrna that is so much  
 commended Rev. ii. 8.) discourse of St. John and his  
 teaching. This he relates of himself in his Epistle  
 to Florinus<sup>t</sup>: and he says, he remembers the thing  
 as if it were but yesterday: for, says he, 'I remem-  
 ' ber the things that were done then, better than I  
 ' do those of later times, (which is the property of  
 ' old men,) so that I could describe the place where  
 ' he sat, and his going out and coming in, his man-  
 ' ner of life, his features, his discourse to the people  
 ' concerning the conversation he had had with John,  
 ' and others that had seen our Lord; how he re-  
 ' hearsed their discourses, and what he had heard  
 ' them that were eyewitnesses of the word of life,  
 ' say of our Lord, and of his miracles and doctrine:  
 ' all agreeable to the scriptures.'

In an age so nigh the apostles, and in a place  
 where one of them had so lately lived, the Christians  
 could not be ignorant what had been done in their  
 time in a matter so public and notorious as is the  
 baptizing or not baptizing of infants.

<sup>s</sup> Iren. lib. iii. c. 3.

<sup>t</sup> Apud Euseb. Hist. lib. v. c. 19.

CHAP. III. VII. It is to be noted, that this testimony of Irenæus, or any other of any of the fathers, is not so much to be regarded as it speaks their opinion or sense, as it is for that it gives us an evidence of what was then believed, taught, or practised by the church. If he had only signified that he thought fit that infants should be regenerated, it had been but one doctor's opinion: but he speaks of it as a thing generally known that they were then usually regenerated.

VIII. Near the time that Irenæus wrote these his books against heresies at Lyons in France, and therein uses the word regeneration for baptism, and speaks of infants as usually regenerated, St. Clement was catechist to the Christian auditors at a very distant place, viz. at Alexandria in Egypt. And he also in all his works commonly uses the phrase of regenerate and regeneration to signify, or connote, the Christian baptism; (as I have largely shewn elsewhere; which is a plain evidence that it was all over the Christian world at that time (as it has been ever since till of late) the usual way of speaking; and does confirm the argument taken from Irenæus's words. I shall here recite but one of the places, which is,

*Clem. Alex. Pædagog. lib. i. c. 6. prope ab initio.*

He is here disputing against some heretics (the Valentinians and some other Gnostics) who affrighted the ordinary Christians; telling them, that baptism, as administered by the Catholics, did not put any one into a complete state of Christianity. They said that some of their other rites were necessary. The Valentinians added a great many (of which I mention some, part ii. ch. v.) without which they said baptism in the form mentioned in scripture did



not make up a complete redemption (as they styled CHAP. III. it), nor was the baptized person τέλειος, perfect, or 92.  
(A.D. 192.) perfectly initiated. Against whom Clement arguing has there such sayings as these :

Ἀναγεννηθέντες οὖν, εὐθέως τὸ τέλειον ἀπειλήφαμεν.  
 ‘ When we are regenerated [by which he plainly  
 ‘ means here *baptized*] we then have received the  
 ‘ perfection.’ And a little after, *Αὐτίκα γοῦν βαπτι-*  
*ζομένῳ τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπ’ οὐρανῶν ἐπήχησε φωνὴ μάρτυς*  
*ἡγαπημένον.* ‘ As soon as Christ was baptized, pre-  
 ‘ sently the voice came from heaven, declaring him  
 ‘ the beloved,’ &c.—Let us then ask these wise men;  
*Σήμερον ἀναγεννηθεὶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἤδη τέλειός ἐστιν;* ἢ  
*ὅπερ ἀτοπώτατον, ἐλλιπής;* ‘ Was Christ, as soon as  
 ‘ he was regenerated, perfect? or will they be so  
 ‘ absurd as to say, He still wanted any thing?’ &c.  
*Ἀμα τοίνυν τῷ βαπτίζεσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰωάννου,*  
*γίνεται τέλειος.* ‘ As soon as baptized by John, he is  
 ‘ perfect.’ *Τελειοῦται δὲ τῷ λουτρῷ μόνῳ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύ-*  
*ματος τῇ καθόδῳ ἀγιάζεται.* ‘ He is perfected [or per-  
 ‘ fectly initiated] by the washing [or baptism] alone,  
 ‘ and sanctified by the coming of the Holy Spirit on  
 ‘ him.’ And a little after he concludes thus: *Ὁ μόνον*  
*ἀναγεννηθεὶς, ὥπεροῦν καὶ τούνομα ἔχει, καὶ φωτισθεὶς,*  
*ἀπήλλακται μὲν παραχρῆμα, &c.* ‘ He that is once  
 ‘ regenerated, as the name of that [sacrament] is, and  
 ‘ enlightened, has his state immediately changed,’ &c.

Here the words *βαπτίζομενος* and *ἀναγεννηθεὶς*, baptized and regenerated, are all along used promiscuously. And Christ himself is in some of the paragraphs said to be baptized by John, and in some regenerated. And moreover Clement says expressly, the word *regeneration* is the name for baptism: so that though he do not here speak of the case of

CHAP. III. infants; yet his use of the word, and his declaring  
 92.  
 (A.D. 192.) it to be the common use, confirms the sense of  
 that saying of Irenæus, which speaks of infants  
 regenerated.

IX. But in another book of the same treatise  
 Clement himself also does so speak, as to suppose  
 and take for granted that the apostles did baptize  
 infants, or little children, *παιδία*, viz.

*Pædagog. lib. iii. c. 11. prope ab initio.*

He is in this chapter giving direction to Christian  
 men and women concerning the gravity and mo-  
 desty to be used in their apparel and ornaments.  
 And among other things speaks of the rings then  
 usually worn on their fingers, and the seals en-  
 graven on them. He earnestly forbids all idolatrous  
 and lascivious pictures or engravings; and advises  
 to such as are innocent, modest, and useful; and  
 says thus :

‘ Let your seal be a dove, or a fish, or a ship  
 ‘ under sail, or a harp, as was that of Polycrates, or  
 ‘ an anchor, which Seleucus made his choice.’ *Κἂν*  
*ἀλιεύων τις ἦ, Ἀποστόλου μεμνήσεται καὶ τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος*  
*ἀνασπασμένων παιδίων.* ‘ And if any one be by trade a  
 ‘ fisherman, he will do well to think of an apostle,  
 ‘ and the children taken out of the water.’

I was, since the last edition, advertised of this  
 passage of Clement by two learned men from dis-  
 tant places of England, much about the same time;  
 the reverend Dr. Jenkins, master of St. John’s col-  
 lege, Cambridge, and the reverend Mr. Holland,  
 rector of Sutton in Wiltshire; as a passage proving  
 infants baptized by the apostles, which I had omit-  
 ted. I am something ashamed of myself for not  
 having observed it. For though it be expressed in

but three words, and therefore might the more easily be overlooked; yet such transient supposals of a thing, and taking it for granted, are in an ancient author rather plainer proofs of its being then generally used or known, than a larger insisting on it would be.

An apostle's taking, drawing, or lifting a child out of the water, cannot refer to any thing that I can think of, but the baptizing of it. And *infantem de fonte levare*, is a phrase used by the ancients, denoting the baptizing of it, almost as commonly as the word baptizing itself. And as the emblem of an anchor, or of a ship under sail, used for the impress of a seal-ring, does suppose those things to be commonly seen, known, and used; so St. Clement's advising the emblem of an apostle baptizing an infant to be used by the Christians in his time (which was but about ninety years after the apostles) for the sculpture of their seals, does suppose it commonly known by them that the apostles did perform that office.

I do not find either by any suggestion of the foresaid learned men, or by any search that I have been able to make, that there is in the editions or manuscript copies any variety in the reading of this place; nor that any commentator has understood it in any other sense. Gentianus Hervetus gives (as Dr. Jenkins has been pleased to inform me) this comment upon it:

‘ Si insculpatur autem in gemma signum piscantis; Meminerit, inquit, qui gestat annulum, Petri, quem Christus fecit piscatorem hominum; et puerorum qui baptizati ex aquæ lavacro, seu piscina extrahuntur.’

CHAP. III.

92.

(A.D. 192.)



CHAP. III. ‘ If there be engraved in a seal ring the picture  
 92.  
 (A.D. 192.) ‘ of a fisherman, [or rather as Clement’s own words  
 ‘ are, *if a fisherman will have an engraving on his*  
 ‘ *seal,*] let him think of St. Peter, whom Christ  
 ‘ made a fisher of men ; and of the children, which  
 ‘ when baptized are drawn out of a laver of water,  
 ‘ as out of a fish-pool.’

Whether there be now remaining any memoir of any such emblem as this, used by the Christians in their seals, I know not. But there is proof that in very ancient times they used this very sculpture on their font stones. For there is at Bridekirk in Cumberland a font stone<sup>u</sup> so ancient that Camden confesses he could not read the inscription on it, nor guess what was meant by several little images which were as he says, ‘ curiously engraven on it.’ But the present bishop of Derry, Dr. Nicholson, late bishop of Carlisle, has both explained the inscription ; and by the imagery, he says, there is ‘ fairly ‘ represented a person in a long sacerdotal habit, ‘ dipping a child into the water ; and a dove, the ‘ emblem no doubt of the Holy Ghost, hovering ‘ over the infant,’ &c. This I took notice of in my former editions, part ii. ch. ii. §. xiv.

But I did not then know that St. Clement had advised such a sculpture for seals.

<sup>u</sup> [For more full accounts and engravings of this font, see Philosophical Transactions for 1685, No. 178 ; Camden’s Britannia by Gibson, and especially by Gough, vol. iii. p. 183 : Nicholson’s History of Westmoreland and Cumberland, 4to. vol. ii. p. 101 ; Archæologia, vol. ii. p. 131 ; and vol. xiv. p. 113.]

## CHAP. IV.

*Out of Tertullian.*

§. I. TERTULLIAN and Origen being the two CHAP IV.  
 next that have said any thing of this matter, their <sup>100.</sup>  
 character is such as requires something to be said (A.D. 200.)  
 of it. They were both of them very learned men;  
 but both inclined to be singular in their opinions,  
 and accordingly both fell into great and monstrous  
 errors in the faith.

The first fell into the heresy of the Montanists, who blasphemously held that one Montanus was that paraclete or comforter which our Saviour promised to send: and that better and fuller discoveries of God's will were made to him than to the apostles, who prophesied only in part. He commonly calls the catholics *psychicos*, 'the carnal men.' And he afterward forsook the Montanists too, and set up a new sect of his own called *Tertullianists*<sup>x</sup>: some remainders of which sect continued at Carthage till St. Austin's time, and he had the happiness to convert the last of them, and to get them to give up their church or place of worship to the catholics.

The other being a great Platonist, taught the preexistence of souls: that the souls of all men had a former being before the world, and had sinned in that former state, and were sent hither into bodies as a punishment: and he derived original sin from thence, which the scripture derives from the fall of Adam<sup>y</sup>. He had also other errors about the resur-

<sup>x</sup> Augustin. de Hæresibus, c. 26, et 86.

<sup>y</sup> Augustin. de Civit. Dei, lib. xi. c. 23.

CHAP. IV. rection and the future state, &c., so that St. Hierome  
 100.  
 (A.D. 200.) giving advice to Tranquilinus<sup>z</sup> of the caution where-  
 with one must read Origen's works, says, ' My  
 ' opinion is, that Origen is sometimes to be read  
 ' because of his learning, but so as we read Tertullian,  
 ' Arnobius, Apollinaris, and some other ecclesiastical  
 ' writers, both Greek and Latin, taking care to  
 ' choose the good that is in them, and avoid the  
 ' contrary.'

As for the occasion I have here to quote them, the rule I mentioned before is chiefly to be minded; that so far as they do, as historians, give us an account of the faith and practice of the church in their times, their testimony is considerable: but where either of them has any particular opinion of his own, it is not of any great authority.

Tertullian has spoke so in this matter of infant-baptism, as that it is hard to reconcile the several passages with one another. The reader shall have the particulars.

*Tertullianus de Baptismo, c. 10.*

II. Having spoken of the matter of baptism, water, and the form of it, *In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, he adds,

' Diximus, quantum mediocritati nostræ licuit, de  
 ' universis, quæ baptismi religionem struunt: nunc  
 ' ad reliquum statum ejus æque, ut potero, pro-  
 ' grediar de quæstiunculis quibusdam.'

' I have, according to my mean ability, discoursed  
 ' of all things that make up the religion [or essence]  
 ' of baptism: now I will proceed to speak of some  
 ' lesser questions about the other state thereof.'

Afterward, c. 12, 13.

<sup>z</sup> Ep. ad Tranquilinum, 76.



## III. 'Quum vero præscribitur nemini sine baptismo

CHAP. IV.

'competere salutem, ex illa maxime pronuntiatione  
 'Domini, qui ait; *Nisi natus ex aqua quis erit, non*  
 'habet vitam: suboriuntur scrupulosi, imo temerarii  
 'retractatus quorundam, quomodo ex ista præscrip-  
 'tione apostolis salus competat, quos tinctos non in-  
 'venimus in Domino, præter Paulum: imo cum  
 'Paulus solus ex illis baptismum Christi induerit,  
 'aut præjudicatum esse de cæterorum periculo, qui  
 'careant aqua Christi, ut præscriptio salva sit: aut  
 'rescindi præscriptionem, si etiam non tinctis salus  
 'statuta est. Audivi (Domino teste) ejusmodi: ne  
 'quis me tam perditum existimet, ut ultro exagitem  
 'libidine styli quæ aliis scrupulum incutiant. Et  
 'nunc illis, ut potero, respondebo qui negant apo-  
 'stolos tinctos. Nam si humanum Johannis bap-  
 'tismum inierant et Dominicum desiderabant (qua-  
 'tenus unum baptismum definierat ipse Dominus,  
 'dicens Petro perfundi volenti; *Qui semel lavit non*  
 'habet necesse rursum: quod utique non tincto  
 'omnino non dixisset) et hæc est probatio exerta  
 'adversus illos qui adimunt apostolis etiam Johannis  
 'baptismum, ut destruant aquæ sacramentum.' Paulo  
 post, 'Hic ergo scelestissimi illi provocant quæstiones:  
 'adeo dicunt, Baptismus non est necessarius, quibus  
 'fides satis est: nam et Abraham nullius aquæ nisi  
 'fidei sacramento Deo placuit.

'Sed in omnibus posteriora concludunt, et se-  
 'quentia antecedentibus prævalent. Fuerit salus  
 'retro per fidem nudam ante Domini passionem, et  
 'resurrectionem: at ubi fides aucta est credendi in  
 'nativitatem, passionem, resurrectionemque ejus;  
 'addita est ampliatio sacramento, obsignatio bap-  
 'tismi, vestimentum quodammodo fidei, quæ retro

CHAP. IV. ' erat nuda, nec potest jam [esse] sine sua lege. Lex  
 100. ' enim tinguendi imposita est et forma præscripta ;  
 (A.D. 200.) ' *Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tingentes eas in nomen*  
 ' *Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* Huic legi col-  
 ' lata definitio illa, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua*  
 ' *et Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum cælorum ;* ob-  
 ' strinxit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem. Itaque  
 ' omnes exinde credentes tinguebantur,' &c.

' Whereas it is an acknowledged rule, that none  
 ' can be saved without baptism, grounded especially  
 ' on that sentence of our Lord, *Unless one be born*  
 ' *of water he cannot be saved :* some scruples do  
 ' arise, and even rash discourses of some men, how  
 ' according to that rule the apostles could be saved,  
 ' whom we do not find to have been baptized with  
 ' our Lord's baptism, except Paul. And when Paul  
 ' only of them had the baptism of Christ, either the  
 ' rest, who wanted this water of Christ, must be  
 ' supposed in a dangerous condition, that so the rule  
 ' may stand fast ; or else the rule is broken, if any  
 ' persons not baptized, can be saved. I have heard  
 ' some men (God is my witness) talk at this rate,  
 ' and would have nobody think me so lewd as by  
 ' the itch of my pen to raise questions purposely,  
 ' which may cause scruples in other men.

' I will here give an answer, as well as I can, to  
 ' those men that deny the apostles to have been bap-  
 ' tized. For if they received only the baptism of  
 ' John as of a man, and had not that of our Lord,  
 ' (inasmuch as our Lord himself had determined that  
 ' there is to be but one baptism, saying to Peter  
 ' when he desired to be washed, *He that has been*  
 ' *once washed, has no need again :* which he would  
 ' not have said to one that had not been washed at

‘ all,) even this is a plain proof against those who  
 ‘ take away from the apostles even the baptism of  
 ‘ John, that they may abolish as needless the sacra-  
 ‘ ment of water.’—And a little after—‘ Here again  
 ‘ these impious men raise cavils, and say, Baptism  
 ‘ is not necessary for those that have faith, which is  
 ‘ sufficient; for Abraham without any sacrament of  
 ‘ water, but of faith only, pleased God.’

‘ But in all matters the later injunctions bind,  
 ‘ and the following rules take place above those that  
 ‘ were before. Though there were salvation for-  
 ‘ merly by bare faith before our Lord’s passion and  
 ‘ resurrection; yet when the faith is enlarged to be-  
 ‘ lieve in his nativity, passion, and resurrection, there  
 ‘ is an enlargement of the sacrament, the sealing of  
 ‘ baptism, as it were a garment to our faith; which  
 ‘ formerly was bare, but cannot now be without its  
 ‘ law: for the law of baptizing is given, and the  
 ‘ form of it appointed; *Go, says he, teach the na-*  
 ‘ *tions, baptizing them in the name of the Father,*  
 ‘ *and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.* And  
 ‘ when to this law that rule is added, *Except one*  
 ‘ *be regenerated of water and the Spirit, he shall*  
 ‘ *not enter into the kingdom of heaven,* it has bound  
 ‘ up faith to a necessity of baptism. And therefore  
 ‘ all believers from thenceforward were baptized,’ &c.

And afterward, c. 17.

IV. Having said that it is not absolutely unlawful for laymen to baptize, he adds:

‘ Sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ  
 ‘ et modestiæ incumbit; cum ea majoribus compe-  
 ‘ tant, ne sibi adsumant dicatum episcopis officium  
 ‘ episcopatus? Æmulatio schismatum mater est.  
 ‘ *Omnia licere, dixit sanctissimus apostolus, sed non*

CHAP. IV.  
 100.  
 (A. D. 200.)



CHAP. IV. ‘*omnia expedire.* Sufficiat scilicet in necessitatibus  
 100. ‘utaris, sicubi aut loci aut temporis aut personæ  
 (A.D. 200.) ‘conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succur-  
 ‘rentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia periculi-  
 ‘tantis. Quoniam reus erit perditioni hominis, si su-  
 ‘persederit præstare quod libere potuit.’

‘But how much more necessary for laymen is it  
 ‘to keep the rules of humility and modesty; that  
 ‘since these things belong to men of higher order,  
 ‘they do not arrogate to themselves the office of the  
 ‘bishops that is proper to them? Emulation is the  
 ‘mother of schism. The most blessed apostle said,  
 ‘that *all things were lawful, but all things were not*  
 ‘*expedient.* Let it suffice that thou make use of  
 ‘this power in cases of necessity: when the circum-  
 ‘stance either of the place, or of the time, or of the  
 ‘person requires it. For then the adventuring to  
 ‘help is well taken, when the condition of a person  
 ‘in danger forces one to it: because he that shall  
 ‘neglect at such a time to do what he lawfully may,  
 ‘will be guilty of the person’s perdition [or damna-  
 ‘tion.]’

Let the reader mind how all this is to be reconciled  
 with what he says afterwards, c. 18.

V. ‘Cæterum baptismum non temere credendum  
 ‘esse sciant quorum officium est. *Omni petenti te*  
 ‘*dato*, suum habet titulum, proinde ad eleemosynam  
 ‘pertinentem. Imo illud potius perspiciendum; *No-*  
 ‘*lite dare sanctum canibus, et porcis projicere mar-*  
 ‘*garita vestra:* et, *Manus ne facile imposueris, ne*  
 ‘*participes aliena delicta.* . . . Itaque pro cujusque  
 ‘personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate,  
 ‘cunctatio baptismi utilior est: præcipue tamen  
 ‘circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est [ ]

‘ sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia et ipsi per  
 ‘ mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt,  
 ‘ et proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem Domi-  
 ‘ nus, *Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire. Veniant*  
 ‘ ergo dum adolescunt, veniant dum discunt, dum  
 ‘ quo veniant docentur: fiant Christiani quum Chris-  
 ‘ tum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas  
 ‘ ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautius agetur in  
 ‘ secularibus; ut cui substantia terrena non creditur,  
 ‘ divina credatur. Norint petere salutem, ut petenti  
 ‘ dedisse videaris. Non minori de causa innupti  
 ‘ quoque procrastinandi, in quibus tentatio præpa-  
 ‘ rata est; tam virginibus per maturitatem, quam  
 ‘ viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant aut con-  
 ‘ tinentiæ corroborentur. Si qui pondus intelligant  
 ‘ baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem quam  
 ‘ dilationem. Fides integra segura est de salute.

‘ Diem baptismo solemniorem Pascha præstat;  
 ‘ cum et passio Domini in quam tingimur, adimpleta  
 ‘ est,’ &c.

‘ But they whose duty it is to administer bap-  
 ‘ tism, are to know that it must not be given rashly.  
 ‘ *Give to every one that asketh thee*, has its proper  
 ‘ subject, and relates to almsgiving: but that com-  
 ‘ mand rather is here to be considered, *Give not*  
 ‘ *that which is holy to dogs, neither cast your pearls*  
 ‘ *before swine*; and that, *Lay hands suddenly on*  
 ‘ *no man, neither be partaker of other men’s faults*.  
 ‘ . . . . Therefore according to every one’s condition  
 ‘ and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of  
 ‘ baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of  
 ‘ little children. For what need is there [            ]  
 ‘ that the godfathers should be brought into danger?  
 ‘ because they may either fail of their promises by

CHAP. IV.

100.

(A.D. 200.)

CHAP. IV. ‘ death, or they may be mistaken by a child’s prov-  
 100. ing of wicked disposition. Our Lord says indeed,  
 (A.D. 200.) ‘ *Do not forbid them to come to me.* Therefore let  
 ‘ them come when they are grown up; let them  
 ‘ come when they understand; when they are in-  
 ‘ structed whither it is that they come; let them  
 ‘ be made Christians when they can know Christ.  
 ‘ What need their guiltless age make such haste to  
 ‘ the forgiveness of sins? Men will proceed more  
 ‘ warily in worldly things; and he that should not  
 ‘ have earthly goods committed to him, yet shall  
 ‘ have heavenly. Let them know how to desire this  
 ‘ salvation, that you may appear to have given to  
 ‘ one that asketh.

‘ For no less reason unmarried persons ought to  
 ‘ be kept off, who are likely to come into tentation,  
 ‘ as well those that never were married, upon  
 ‘ account of their coming to ripeness, as those in  
 ‘ widowhood for the miss of their partner: until  
 ‘ they either marry or be confirmed in continence.  
 ‘ They that understand the weight of baptism will  
 ‘ rather dread the receiving it than the delaying  
 ‘ of it. An entire faith is secure of salvation.

‘ The most solemn time for baptism is Easter, at  
 ‘ which time the passion of our Lord, into which we  
 ‘ are baptized, was fulfilled,’ &c.

Let there be also compared with this, what he  
 says in another book.

*Tertullianus de Anima, c. 39, 40.*

VI. ‘ Adeo nulla ferme nativitas munda est,  
 ‘ utique ethnicorum. Hinc enim et apostolus ex  
 ‘ sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari ait:  
 ‘ tam ex seminis prærogativa, quam ex institutionis  
 ‘ disciplina: cæterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur.



‘ Quasi designatos tamen sanctitati, ac per hoc etiam  
 ‘ saluti intelligi volens fidelium filios : ut hujus  
 ‘ spei pignore matrimoniis quæ retinenda censuerat  
 ‘ patrocinaretur. Alioquin meminerat Dominicæ de-  
 ‘ finitionis, *Nisi quis nascetur ex aqua et spiritu,*  
 ‘ *non ibit in regnum Dei*, i. e. non erit sanctus. Ita  
 ‘ omnis anima eousque in Adam censetur, donec in  
 ‘ Christo recenseatur ; tamdiu immunda, quamdiu  
 ‘ recenseatur : peccatrix autem, quia immunda.’

‘ So there is almost no being born clean, [or free  
 ‘ from sin,] that is of heathens. For hence the  
 ‘ apostle says, that of either parent sanctified, the  
 ‘ children that are born are holy, by reason of the  
 ‘ prerogative of that seed, and also the instruction in  
 ‘ their education. Else, says he, were they unclean.  
 ‘ But yet meaning to be understood thus: that the  
 ‘ children of the faithful are designed for holiness,  
 ‘ and so for salvation ; that by a pledge of such hope  
 ‘ he might plead for those marriages which he would  
 ‘ have to be continued. Otherwise [or, as for any  
 ‘ other meaning] he knew well enough what our  
 ‘ Lord had determined, *Except one be born of water*  
 ‘ *and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom*  
 ‘ *of God*, that is, he shall not be holy. Thus every  
 ‘ soul is reckoned as in Adam, so long till it be  
 ‘ anew enrolled in Christ, and so long unclean, till  
 ‘ it be so enrolled, and sinful because unclean,’ &c.

VII. I have cited these passages at large and all together, that the reader may try if he can pick any coherent sense out of them. It is the property of warm men, when they are speaking earnestly on one subject and urging that, to overlash so, as that when they are speaking on another with like earnestness, they fall into contradiction of what they

CHAP. IV.

100.

(A. D. 200.)

CHAP. IV. said before. This author in the places here first  
 100.  
 (A.D. 200.) cited, treating of the necessity of baptism, speaks of that necessity as absolute; and of those that die unbaptized, as lost men: and is enraged at those that maintain that faith without it is sufficient to salvation. Yet afterward, when he is discoursing of the *weight*, as he calls it, of baptism, he advises several sorts of people to delay it; and to encourage them, tells them that if they should by that delay happen to miss of it, ‘an entire faith is secure of ‘salvation.’

The most probable guess that I can make of that which was his steady meaning (if he had any) is, that those who put off their baptism negligently, or as slighting it, do, if they finally die without it, lose their life: but that in those that put it off only that they may be fitter for it, and in a more likely condition to keep it unstained, if by that means they happen to die without it, the will and purpose of being baptized shall be accepted for the deed.

And when he is discoursing on the aforesaid subject of the weight of baptism, he finds fault with the custom of baptizing infants, and would have them delayed till they are able to understand and consider what they do, and then further till they are married; and if they do not marry, or if their consort die, then further till the danger of lust is over, which is frequently not till old age. A strange advice, and which no men, either of the ancients or moderns, either of the one or the other side in this controversy, do approve of. And to urge his opinion the more, he speaks of infants as if they were innocent or sinless, and so had no need of the forgiveness of sins granted in this sacrament.

Yet in the last cited place, when he is on an-CHAP.IV.  
 other theme, he plainly owns the catholic doctrine  
 of original sin in infants; and that every soul born <sup>100.</sup> (A.D. 200.  
 of Adam is unclean and sinful, and continues so till  
 it be enrolled or ranked anew in Christ: and cites,  
 as pertinent to their case, the prescription, as he  
 calls it, or the standing rule, John iii. 5, *Except*  
*any one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot*  
*enter into God's kingdom.*

How to reconcile this diversity, I know not, unless his meaning (when he would have spoken for good) were, that the baptism of infants, and of those other sorts of persons, should be delayed till the times he speaks of, in case there were no danger of death in the mean while; but that in case of such danger it should be administered presently: in which case he says it is so necessary, that any one that is present (whether in orders or not, so he determines it) ought to administer it, or else he is guilty of the person's ruin or perdition.

VIII. And I like this my resolution of his opinion the better, because I find it to be what several of each of the disagreeing parties do agree to have been his sense. For as Mr. Baxter<sup>a</sup> makes this acknowledgment, 'Yet again I will confess, that the words of Tertullian and Nazianzen shew, that it was long before all were agreed of the very time, or of the necessity of baptizing infants, before any use of reason, in case they were like to live to maturity.' So Mr. Danvers<sup>b</sup> his antagonist owns

<sup>a</sup> More Proofs of Infants' Church-membership and consequently their right to Baptism; in three parts. Pt. ii. ch 4. §. 59. 8vo. Lond. 1675.

<sup>b</sup> First Answer to Wills, p. 9. 8vo. Lond. 1675.



CHAP. IV. this, ‘Tertullian, that, as Dr. Barlow tells us, was  
 100.  
 (A.D. 200.) ‘so great an opposer of infant baptism, as irrational  
 ‘and unwarrantable, yet had this fancy of baptizing  
 ‘a dying child to save it.’ Somebody or other had  
 so strangely imposed upon this man, that he thought  
 the modern pædobaptists were ashamed to own this  
 doctrine, that a child or other person is to be bap-  
 tized that he may be saved. Also Mr. Tombes  
 says<sup>c</sup>, ‘If he [Tertullian] did allow it, it was only  
 ‘in case of necessity, as may appear by his words in  
 ‘his book *de Anima*, c. 39.’ And to name one of  
 the church of Rome, Vasquez says, that ‘those  
 ‘places in the book *de Anima*, and those where he  
 ‘makes baptism necessary to salvation, do not prove  
 ‘that he recanted his opinion<sup>d</sup>, for he might well  
 ‘enough assert that baptism is necessary for all,  
 ‘and yet think that it was not to be given before  
 ‘adult age in any other case but only that of ex-  
 ‘treme necessity.’

This explication of his meaning is also confirmed  
 from the older editions of this book, *de Baptismo*,  
 which instead of those words in Rigaltius’s edition,  
 ‘*Quid enim necesse est sponsores,*’ &c. ‘What need  
 ‘is there that godfathers,’ &c. read thus: ‘*Quid*  
 ‘*enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, sponsores,*’ &c.  
 ‘What occasion is there, except in case of necessity,  
 ‘that the godfathers,’ &c. So it is in the edition of  
 Pamelius: and so, as Pamelius affirms, Gaigneus  
 the first editor of this book, *de Baptismo*, has it.  
 But I have followed the edition which I had, which

<sup>c</sup> Examen of Marshal’s Sermon, [forming part of his *Two Treatises concerning Infant Baptism*, 4to. 1645.] p. 10.

<sup>d</sup> Gabriel Vasquez, *Commentaria in tertiam partem Thomæ*, fol. 1610. &c. tom. ii. disp. 154. c. i.

is Rigaltius's, (only leaving a blank at the place,) CHAP. IV.  
 supposing he had some ground from the manuscripts 100.  
 to leave out that clause. Yet it cannot be denied (A. D. 260.)  
 that he has (as Mr. le Clerc<sup>e</sup> observes) set some passages false, that were true in the former editions; nor that he has otherwise shewn himself partial for the antipædobaptists, as I shall shew hereafter, pt. ii. ch. xi. §. 5. And therefore I incline now to the opinion, that the old editions are the truest, and that it ought to be read, 'except in case of necessity.' And then the case is plain how his meaning was.

IX. But that which most deserves the reader's observation is, that the words of Tertullian do not import that the custom of the Christians at that time was to leave infants unbaptized: but on the contrary, they plainly intimate that there was a custom of baptizing them: only he dislikes that that custom should be generally used. For when he says, 'Why does that innocent age make such haste,' &c. his words shew the matter of fact to have been so, together with his opinion against it. But the thing we now inquire of, is the practice of the church, and not one doctor's opinion, especially when it does not appear that any body was prevailed on by him to alter that practice; for there is no appearance that either the Montanists (to whom he turned) or the Tertullianists (whom he set up) were against it. On the contrary, St. Austin<sup>f</sup> reciting the opinions of both these sects, does not mention any such thing held by either of them, and says at other places,

<sup>e</sup> Quæstiones Hieronymæ. Q. ix. c. 3. 8vo. 1701.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. de Hæresibus, c. 26. 86.

CHAP. IV. that he never read of any sect that did deny it, as I  
 100. shew hereafter.

(A. D. 200.) The same observation ought to be made concerning the sponsors or godfathers, whom he speaks of as used in the baptism of infants that could not answer for themselves. Which shews the great mistake of some of the more ignorant persons among the antipædobaptists, who derive the use of godfathers from I know not what pope of Rome of late years; whereas this was within a 100 years of the apostles.

X. It is a heedless answer that he makes to those words of our Saviour, *Suffer little children to come to me, &c.*, when he says, ‘Let them come when they are grown up, when they understand,’ &c. For that seems to be the very thing that the disciples said, when they rebuked those that brought them, for which rebuke our Saviour blamed the disciples. It is something a better answer which the antipædobaptists nowadays give, viz. that our Saviour would indeed have infants brought to him in their infancy, and before they understood, and that he blessed them, &c. but we do not read that he baptized them. To which the other reply, that he declared the love of God to them, by his blessing and embracing, and saying, *Of such is the kingdom of God.* Which shews them to be capable of the covenant of mercy, and that infants are expressly admitted to enter covenant, Deut. xxix. 10, *you, your little ones, &c.*, and in the Old Testament had the seal of the covenant. From whence it will follow that it is no absurdity by reason of their nonage; which is the only thing Tertullian argues from. And besides, when our Saviour says, *Of*



*such is the kingdom of God*; (which shews them CHAP. IV. to be capable of his kingdom,) and thereupon orders 100. them to be *brought to him*, and says, *forbid* [(A.D. 200.) or withhold] *them not*: since he is now present with us only in his ordinances and sacraments, what way have we to bring our children to him, as he orders, but by baptism to offer and dedicate them to him?

XI. In the same book of baptism, c. 5, he observes that the heathen nations also used baptism as a religious rite, and particularly in the Mysteries of Apollo and Ceres, persons were baptized, ‘*Idque se in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuriorum suorum agere præsumunt.*’ ‘And they say, they do this for their regeneration and the pardon of their former perjuries.’ And he says, ‘Here we see the aim of the Devil imitating the things of God.’ He means, the heathens imitated the Jewish baptism.

XII. One thing more ought to be observed out of the passage I cited from Tertullian’s book, *de Anima*, viz. that he expounds that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Else were your children unclean, but now they are holy*, much after the same rate as many modern pædobaptists do of baptismal holiness: only he thinks the apostle speaks of it, not as then given, but as designed for them. He paraphrases, *sancti*, ‘holy,’ by *sanctitati designati*, ‘designed for holiness,’ (viz. when they come to be baptized, as his following words in the said passage shew, if the reader will turn back to them.) This sense of a baptismal holiness the antipædobaptists (who understand no more by it but that such children are not bastards) would condemn as a new exposition: but I shall shew by more instances that will come in my

CHAP. IV. way, and especially in ch. xix. §. 19, where I compare together all the expositions of this text given <sup>100.</sup> (A.D. 200.) by the ancients, that it was the most general one.

XIII. It is plain that St. Austin, and Pelagius, and several others that managed the Pelagian controversy, had never seen Tertullian's book of baptism. For when St. Austin<sup>g</sup> pleaded that no Christian, catholic or sectary, had ever taught to the contrary, but that one reason for the baptizing of infants was for the forgiveness of original sin; Pelagius granted<sup>h</sup> that there was none that denied that they were to be baptized: but when he, and Celestius, and Julian, do ransack antiquity for places to shew that they are baptized on other accounts, and not for forgiveness; how neatly would that saying of Tertullian have fitted them, 'What need their innocent [or sinless] age make such haste for the forgiveness of sin?' Or else we must say, they would not quote it, because he contradicts himself in this point. Or else they would not use his authority, which was in no good repute, because he revolted to heresy: though Dr. Allix<sup>i</sup> concludes this book to have been written before.

It was customary in those times, if any one made use of Tertullian's authority in any controverted matter, to stop his mouth with that saying of St. Hierome<sup>k</sup>, 'Illum hominem ecclesiæ non fuisse,' 'that Tertullian was not a man of the church;' and

<sup>g</sup> See ch. 19. §. 17.

<sup>h</sup> See ch. 19. §. 30.

<sup>i</sup> [See 'Dissertatio de Tertulliani vita et scriptis,' (an octavo tract of 88 pages, without date, place, or author's name, but written by Dr. P. Allix, and printed at Paris in 1680,) ch. 4. p. 28.]

<sup>k</sup> Adv. Helvidium.

Pelagius had a great mind (if it had been possible for CHAP. IV. him, continuing in his opinion of denying original 100. sin) to have continued a member of the catholic (A.D. 200.) church.

Baronius likewise observes, that when the Donatists maintained against St. Austin and the catholics, that baptism given by heretics is null, and the party must be baptized again; if St. Austin could have shewn, that this opinion was first set on foot by Tertullian, (whose name was in ill repute for his singular opinions,) that that one thing would have served much to discredit it. And that he might have done, if he had ever seen this book of baptism, where that opinion is asserted, c. 15, which is the earliest mention we find of it.

Yet St. Hierome had seen this book either in Greek or Latin, (in both which languages it was written,) for he quotes some passages out of it about the story of St. Paul and Tecla, but nothing about the matter of infants.

---

## CHAP. V.

*Quotations out of Origen.*

*Homilia 8. in Levit. c. 4.*

§. I. ‘AUDI David dicentem; *In iniquitatibus,* 110.  
‘inquit, *conceptus sum, et in peccatis peperit me* (A.D. 210.)  
‘*mater mea*: ostendens, quod quæcunque animam  
‘carne nascitur, iniquitatis et peccati sorde pollui-  
‘tur: et propterea dictum esse illud, quod jam su-  
‘perius memoravimus; *quia nemo mundus a sorde,*  
‘*nec si unius diei sit vita ejus.* Addi his etiam



CHAP. V. ' illud potest, ut requiratur, quid causæ sit, cum  
 110.  
 (A.D. 210.) ' baptisma ecclesiæ pro remissione peccatorum detur,  
 ' secundum ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis bap-  
 ' tismum dari: cum utique si nihil esset in parvulis,  
 ' quod ad remissionem deberet, et indulgentiam  
 ' pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur.'

' Hear David speaking, *I was*, says he, *con-  
 ' ceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring  
 ' me forth*: shewing that every soul that is born  
 ' in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and  
 ' iniquity: and that therefore that was said which  
 ' we mentioned before; that *none is clean from  
 ' pollution, though his life be but of the length of one  
 ' day.*

✓ ' Besides all this, let it be considered, what is the  
 ' reason that whereas the baptism of the church is  
 ' given for forgiveness of sins, infants also are by  
 ' the usage of the church baptized: when if there  
 ' were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness  
 ' and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless  
 ' to them.'

*Homil. in Lucam 14.*

II. ' Quod frequenter inter fratres quæritur, loci  
 ' occasione commota [l. commotus] retracto. Par-  
 ' vuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quo-  
 ' rum peccatorum? Vel quo tempore peccaverunt?  
 ' Aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio  
 ' subsistere, nisi juxta illum sensum de quo paulo  
 ' ante diximus; nullus mundus a sorde, nec si unius  
 ' diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram? Et quia  
 ' per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes depo-  
 ' nuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli.'

' Having occasion given in this place, I will men-  
 ' tion a thing that causes frequent inquiries among

‘ the brethren. Infants are baptized for the forgive-  
 ‘ ness of sins. Of what sins? Or when have they  
 ‘ sinned? Or how can any reason of the laver in  
 ‘ their case hold good, but according to that sense  
 ‘ that we mentioned even now: none is free from  
 ‘ pollution, though his life be but of the length of  
 ‘ one day upon the earth? And it is for that reason  
 ‘ because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution  
 ‘ of our birth is taken away, that infants are bap-  
 ‘ tized.’

CHAP. V.

110.

(A.D. 210.)

*Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos, lib. v. c. 9.*

III. ‘ Denique et in lege pro parvulo, qui natus  
 ‘ fuerit, jubetur offerri hostia, *par turturum, aut*  
 ‘ *duo pulli columbini: ex quibus unus pro peccato,*  
 ‘ *et alius in holocaustum.* Pro quo peccato offer-  
 ‘ tur hic pullus unus? Nunquid nuper editus parvu-  
 ‘ lus peccare jam potuit? Et tamen habet peccatum,  
 ‘ pro quo hostia jubetur offerri, a quo mundus ne-  
 ‘ gatur quis esse, nec si unius diei fuerit vita ejus.  
 ‘ De hoc ergo etiam David dixisse credendus est  
 ‘ illud quod supra memoravimus, *Quia in peccato*  
 ‘ *concepit me mater mea:* secundum historiam enim  
 ‘ nullum matris ejus declaratur peccatum. Pro hoc  
 ‘ et ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam  
 ‘ parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi qui-  
 ‘ bus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum,  
 ‘ quod essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati,  
 ‘ quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent: propter  
 ‘ quas etiam corpus ipsum, corpus peccati, nomina-  
 ‘ tur.’

‘ And also in the law it is commanded, that a sa-  
 ‘ crifice be offered for every child that is born, a  
 ‘ *pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons: of*  
 ‘ *which one is for a sin offering, the other for a*

CHAP. V. ‘*burnt offering*<sup>1</sup>. For what sin is this one pigeon  
 110.  
 (A.D. 210.) ‘ offered? Can the child that is new born have com-  
 ‘ mitted any sin? It has even then sin, for which  
 ‘ the sacrifice is commanded to be offered; from  
 ‘ which even he whose life is but of one day is de-  
 ‘ nied to be free. Of this sin David is to be supposed  
 ‘ to have said that which we mentioned before, *In*  
 ‘ *sin did my mother conceive me*: for there is in  
 ‘ the history no account of any particular sin that  
 ‘ his mother had committed.

‘ For this also it was, that the church had from  
 ‘ the apostles a tradition [or order] to give baptism  
 ‘ even to infants. For they, to whom the divine  
 ‘ mysteries were committed, knew that there is in  
 ‘ all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must  
 ‘ be done away by water and the Spirit: by reason  
 ‘ of which the body itself is also called the body of  
 ‘ sin.’

IV. The plainness of these testimonies is such as  
 needs nothing to be said of it, nor admits any thing  
 to be said against it. They do not only suppose the  
 practice to be generally known and used, but also  
 mention its being ordered by the apostles.

But concerning the authenticalness of them there  
 does need something to be said. For the Greek  
 (which is the original) of all Origen’s works being  
 lost, except a very few, there remains only the Latin  
 translations of them. And when these translations  
 were collected together, a great many spurious ones  
 were added and mixed with them, and went under  
 Origen’s name. But upon the renewal of learning,  
 the critics quickly smelt them out, and admitted  
 none for his, but such as appeared to have been done

<sup>1</sup> Levit. xii. 8.



into Latin either by St. Hierome or else by Rufinus : CHAP.V.  
 both of whom lived within the time limited for our 110.  
 present inquiry, viz. the first 400 years. (A.D. 210.)

For which reason I have rejected the quotations brought by some for infant baptism out of Origen on Job, which is plainly a spurious piece written by some Arian.

V. Of these which I have brought, the Homilies on St. Luke were translated by St. Hierome ; but those on Leviticus and the Comments on the Epistle to the Romans, by Rufinus. St. Hierome added a preface to his translation, which is printed with it ; a passage out of which is quoted by Rufinus<sup>m</sup>, and also some part of the translation itself. And St. Hierome himself mentions this work in the catalogue of his own works<sup>n</sup>. So that of this there is no doubt. Erasmus once doubted whether even these homilies were the genuine works of Origen, as Hue-tius observes in these words<sup>o</sup>: ‘ Erasmus in his  
 ‘ Epistle to Francis Ciglianus, had written that  
 ‘ these Homilies did seem to be some other man’s  
 ‘ and not Origen’s : but in his Censure affixed to  
 ‘ the books of Origen, he recanted his opinion, and  
 ‘ acknowledged the true author.’ Which I the rather note, because Mr. Tombes<sup>p</sup> and Mr. Danvers<sup>q</sup> do quote Erasmus on Luke i. 3, saying thus : ‘ For  
 ‘ so he seems to think, whoever he was, whose Com-  
 ‘ mentaries are extant upon Luke, under the title  
 ‘ of Adamantius, [or Origen.] From whence they

<sup>m</sup> Apolog. adv. Hieronym. secunda.

<sup>n</sup> De Scriptoribus Eccl.

<sup>o</sup> Origenianorum. lib. iii. p. 253. edit. Rothomagi, 1668.

<sup>p</sup> Third Review, or third part of Antipædobaptism, 4to. 1657.

<sup>q</sup> First Reply to Mr. Wills, p. 87

CHAP.V. ‘conclude that Erasmus took them not to be Ori-  
110.  
 (A.D.210.) ‘gen’s, or at least doubted of it.’ Which is not fair,  
 if they knew that Erasmus had recanted his doubt,  
 as is to be seen in his edition of Origen’s works.

VI. Neither does any one raise any question of the translation of the other two, on Leviticus and the Romans, but that it was done by Rufinus. But these two men used several methods in translating. For, whereas Origen’s books contained in them several expressions not consistent with the faith in some points; St. Hierome<sup>r</sup> changed nothing, but expressed every thing as it was in the original, as he owns himself: but Rufinus altered or left out any thing that he thought not orthodox. And in the Homilies on Leviticus he himself says, that he took a greater liberty than ordinary.

All the world since have approved the method of St. Hierome, and blamed that of Rufinus: for it is fit for a translator to give a true account of what his author says, be it good or bad. Whereas now in these translations of Rufinus, the reader is uncertain (as Erasmus angrily says) whether he read Origen or Rufinus.

Some antipædobaptists do for this reason reject the quotations here brought out of the Homilies on Leviticus and the Romans: it being uncertain whether they are the words of the author, or the additions or interpolations of the translator. This plea must needs give some abatement to the authority of these two testimonies: yet it is the less in this matter, because,

1. That on St. Luke, translated by St. Hierome, contains the same thing in effect: it is as full an

<sup>r</sup> Vide Erasmus in Censura operum Origenis.

evidence of the then practice, only it does not mention the tradition from the apostles.

2. There is no kind of probability that Rufinus (whatever interpolations he might make in other matters) made any alteration in this; since this was none of the subjects on which Origen's opinion was questioned by the church in Rufinus's time. Those things in which he was singular, are largely canvassed both by St. Hierome and Rufinus themselves in their invectives and apologies one against another: and also by Epiphanius<sup>s</sup>, and Theophilus<sup>t</sup>, bishop of Alexandria, who reckons thirty-five singular opinions that Origen held: and they are about the resurrection of the same body, the eternity of hell torments, the preexistence of souls, some expressions about the Trinity, &c., but not one word about this matter. And there is no pretence that Rufinus had any other occasion to alter any thing, but only as being a great lover of Origen, whatever was in his comments expressed in a doubtful or heterodox sense concerning any of the aforesaid points, he left it out, or else gave it a favourable turn in the translation, or in some explication that he added. But what is this to the baptism of infants, concerning which it is not pretended that Origen's enemies challenged him as holding any singular opinion?

3. Rufinus (who confesses that in the translation of the Comments on Leviticus, he had used more freedom) says only this of his management in the Translation of the Comments on the Epistle to the Romans, that he had 'shortened this work by one

<sup>s</sup> Epist. ad Joannem Hierosolymit.

<sup>t</sup> Epistolæ Paschales, B. P. tom. iv.



CHAP. V. ‘half<sup>u</sup>.’ He speaks of no addition to that; and it  
 110.  
 (A.D. 210.) is in that that there is mention of the tradition  
 from apostles.

VII. Mr. Tombes says<sup>x</sup>, that ‘if one read these  
 ‘passages, and consider how they are brought in,  
 ‘and how plain the expressions are against the Pe-  
 ‘lagians, one shall conceive that they were put in  
 ‘after the Pelagian heresy was confuted by Hierome  
 ‘and Austin, who often tells us that the fathers,  
 ‘afore that controversy arose, did not speak plainly  
 ‘against the Pelagians. And of all others Origen  
 ‘is most taxed as pelagianizing.’

If the passages did speak of, or relate to any  
 contest about the doctrine of original sin, or any  
 adversaries to it; or did set themselves to prove it  
 as a thing controverted: this exception would have  
 some weight. But they speak of it as a supposed  
 and known thing from scripture, and as of a thing  
 denied by none, and in no other style than many  
 sayings of other fathers do before Pelagius’s time,  
 some of which I cited out of Irenæus<sup>y</sup>. And the  
 opinion in which Origen pelagianized, was not, as  
 Mr. Tombes would intimate, in denying that corrupt  
 state in which all are born into this world, (his  
 asserting of that in many other places is notorious,  
 and he built his opinion of preexistence on it,) but  
 in affirming that it is possible for a man in this life  
 to arrive at such a perfect conquest of the said cor-  
 ruption, that he may afterward live without sin:  
 which was another of the false doctrines of Pelagius.  
 This is plainly proved to have been the opinion  
 of Origen, from the few words of St. Hierome in

<sup>u</sup> Præfat. in Epist. ad Romanos.

<sup>x</sup> Examen, p. 7.

<sup>y</sup> Ch. 3. §. 1.

the Prologue to his Dialogues against the Pelagians ; CHAP. V.  
 where, having recited the opinions of some former  
 heretics that vaunted themselves to be without sin, 110.  
(A.D. 210.)

he adds, ‘ *Illud autem Origenis proprium est,*’ &c.  
 ‘ But Origen had this peculiar opinion, that it is im-  
 ‘ possible for a human soul to be without sin from  
 ‘ its beginning to its death : and on the other side,  
 ‘ that it is possible, when a man turns himself to a  
 ‘ good life, to arrive to such strength, that after-  
 ‘ wards he shall not sin.’ It was on account of this  
 tenet that St. Hierome calls Origen ‘ the Pelagians’  
 ‘ beloved<sup>2</sup>.’ Which he does at the latter end of the  
 last of the dialogues above-mentioned. Mr. Tombes  
 might easily have observed in those few works of  
 Origen, that are left in the original, as plain expres-  
 sions against the Pelagians (as he calls it, i. e. as  
 plain mentions of original sin) as there are in these  
 passages. As in his seventh book against Celsus,  
 (§. 50.) p. 365. ed. Cant. 1658, he discourses much  
 as he does here, how the books of the Old Testament  
 do order a sin offering to be offered, *καὶ περὶ τῶν*  
*ἄρτι γεγεννημένων, ὥς οὐ καθαρῶν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας :* ‘ even  
 ‘ for infants new born, as being not clear from sin.’  
 Where he proceeds, on the same argument, to quote,  
 as he does here, the saying of David, psalm li. 5, and  
 several such texts.

VIII. But this argument of Mr. Tombes may be  
 well retorted against those that think these passages  
 were put in by Rufinus. (Mr. Tombes in one part of  
 his discourse seems to lay it on him, and yet in an-  
 other, seems to think they were put in by somebody  
 afterward : or else he speaks absurdly when he

<sup>2</sup> [‘ *Amasium vestrum.*’ See Hierom. opera, tom. ii. p. 792.  
 edit. Vallarsii.]

CHAP.V. makes it to be done after the Pelagian times.) For  
 110.  
 (A.D. 210.) whoever had put in any thing of original sin, Rufinus would not : he had been more likely to rase it out, if he had not been afraid of censure. For though he seems to have concealed his opinion from the world, except some few confidants, it was proved after his death, that he was an enemy to the doctrine of original sin, at least as derived from our first parents. St. Hierome does once or twice reckon him by the name of Grunnius<sup>a</sup> among the precursors, or those that had given occasion to Pelagius. He himself tells how some had accused him to Anastasius bishop of Rome, as having unsound opinions about the origin of the soul : and he makes but a lame answer to it, in the letter which he writes to him for his apology. But Celestius discovered all, when being upon his trial at a council of Carthage, (in which he was condemned for this heresy,) there were these examinations and answers, which St. Austin has quoted out of the Acts of that Council<sup>b</sup>, which was held anno Dom. 412.

‘ The bishop Aurelius said, Let the rest [of the  
 ‘ articles charged on him] be read.

‘ And there was read, That the sin of Adam hurt  
 ‘ himself only, and not mankind.

‘ Celestius answered, I said, that I was unresolved  
 ‘ concerning the derivation of sin, (yet so as to sub-  
 ‘ mit to any one to whom God has given the grace  
 ‘ of knowledge,) because I have heard different opin-  
 ‘ ions of this from those that have been presbyters of  
 ‘ the catholic church.

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Tell us their names.

<sup>a</sup> Ep. ad Ctesiphontem ; item, Præfat. lib. iv. in Jeremiam.

<sup>b</sup> Lib. de Peccato Originali, c. 34.



‘ Celestius said, The holy presbyter Rufinus, who dwelt at Rome with holy Pammachius ; I have heard him say, that there is no derivation of sin. CHAP.V.  
110.  
(A.D.210.)

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Are there any more ?

‘ Celestius said, I have heard others also say the same.

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Tell us their names ?

‘ Celestius said, Is not one presbyter enough for you ?

And afterward, in another place [of the Acts].

‘ Aurelius the bishop said, Let the rest of the charge be read.

‘ And there was read, That infants when they are born are in the same state that Adam was in before his transgression.

‘ Aurelius the bishop said, Did you ever teach so, Celestius, that infants, &c. ?

‘ Celestius said, Let him explain how he means ; before his transgression, &c.

‘ Aurelius the bishop said, Whether the state of infants now to be baptized, be such as Adam’s was before his transgression : or whether they do derive the guilt of transgression from the same sinful origin from whence they are born ? This is what the deacon Paulinus would hear from you.

‘ Paulinus the deacon said, Whether he has taught that or not, let him deny.

‘ Celestius said, I told you before concerning the derivation of sin, that I have heard several in the catholic church deny it : and some I have heard affirm it. It is a matter of question [or controversy] not of heresy. As for infants, I always said, that they stand in need of baptism, and that they ought to be baptized,’ &c.

CHAP.V. We see that though Celestius pretended he could  
 110.  
 (A.D.210.) have named others, yet he named none but Rufinus, who was dead, as holding this tenet. Rufinus therefore was not likely to insert any thing into Origen's works about original sin.

I know that Garner the Jesuit would have it, that the Rufinus intended by Celestius was another of the same name, and not he whose works we have: and that, because Mercator calls him a Syrian; whereas this Rufinus whose works we have, was of Aquileia. But others with more reason think, that Mercator calls him a Syrian only because he lived thirty years in Syria and those eastern parts, and brought his errors and his love of Origen from thence. And the Rufinus meant by Celestius, has always been taken for the same that is ordinarily known by that name.

IX. There would have been the less need of this long disquisition to prove that the forecited passages of Origen are genuine, if that passage of his, which sir Peter (now lord chief justice) King has found out in the original Greek of his Commentaries on St. Matthew, and produces<sup>c</sup> to this purpose as an evidence for infant baptism, were not a very ambiguous one. If the sentence had ended there where sir Peter cuts it off, it had been a plain case that Origen must have been understood to speak there of infants in age. But some words which he has left out, do, when they are read with the rest, very much puzzle the cause, and make it doubtful whether Origen be to be there understood of infants in age, or of such Christian men as are indued with the

<sup>c</sup> Inquiry into the Constitution, Discipline, &c. of the Primitive Church, p. 57. 8vo. Lond. 1712.

innocence and simplicity of infants. The impartial CHAP. V.  
management which I have promised, obliges me to 110.  
set down the whole place, or else none of it. (A.D. 210.)

Origen is there commenting on those words of our Saviour, Matt. xviii. 10, *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones: for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.* He has a long discourse, and something rambling: speaking sometimes of infants in age (such as our Saviour had one then before him, mentioned ver. 2.) and sometimes of men resembling infants. After which he puts this question:

*Comment. in Matt.* tom. xiii. p. 331. ed. Huetii, *Rhotomag.* 1668. [§. 27. tom. iii. p. 607. ed. Benedict.]

Εἶτα πάλιν ζητήσειεν ἂν τις, πότε τῶν δεικνυμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος μικρῶν οἱ λεγόμενοι αὐτῶν ἄγγελοι προϊστανται; πότερον δεξάμενοι τὴν οἰκονομίαν περὶ αὐτοὺς διοικεῖν ἀφ' οὗ διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας, ᾧ ἐγεννήθησαν, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν καὶ ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθοῦσι, καὶ μηκέτι ὑποκείμενοι πονηρᾷ τινι δυνάμει; ἢ ἀπὸ γενέσεως, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόγνωσιν καὶ τὸν προορισμὸν αὐτοῦ, &c.

‘ Then again one may inquire, when it is that  
‘ the angels here spoken of are set over those  
‘ little ones shewed [or signified] by our Saviour?  
‘ Whether they take the care and management of  
‘ them from the time, when they by the washing of  
‘ regeneration, whereby they were new born, do, as  
‘ new born babes desire the sincere milk of the word,  
‘ and are no longer subject to any evil power? Or  
‘ from their birth, according to the foreknowledge of  
‘ God and his predestinating of them,’ &c.

If Origen meant to say, that it is a question



CHAP.V. whether such a little child as our Saviour then set  
 110.  
 (A.D.210.) before the apostles, have his guardian angel given him by God from his birth, or from his baptism; then it is a plain supposal that such infants were baptized. But his mention of their desiring of the milk of the word at the time of their baptism, makes it doubtful whether he meant of such who are infants in a proper sense, or whether he had in his mind at that place such men as he had before called Christ's little ones, i. e. men, who when converted and baptized, do become humble in spirit, &c. And this doubt is increased by observing the answer that he gives to this his own question: for he says, that for one side of it, (viz. that the guardian angel is given to every one from his birth,) these places of scripture do make: *God, who separated me from my mother's womb<sup>d</sup>*: and, *Before thou camest forth out of the womb, I sanctified thee<sup>e</sup>*, &c. But for the other side (viz. that it is at baptism that the good angel is given) this does make, that *the time of people's unbelief is under the angels of Satan: and then after their new birth, he that has bought us with his own blood, delivers them to a good angel*. He has also another fancy, that possibly the evil angel that presides over a man during his heathenism, is at the man's conversion converted also himself, and becomes a good angel to him.

Moreover in the text itself, though our Saviour had begun his discourse with taking a little child, and telling them they must *humble themselves as that little child*; yet in the process of it, (and before he came to speak the forecited words,) viz. at

<sup>d</sup> Gal. i. 15.

<sup>e</sup> Jer. i. 5.

ver. 6. he uses the phrase of *little ones which believe* CHAP.V.  
*in him.*

So that upon the whole, the proof of infant baptism from this place of Origen, does labour under considerable ambiguity; and it is better for the pædobaptists not so to rely upon it for a proof of Origen's sense, but that they do adhere likewise to those passages of his which I recited before; which, though they are but translations of such books of his, the original whereof is not now extant, yet they are, as I have shewn, translations well attested.

I will add to this one passage more, in which Origen brings in this text of scripture, which is,

*Hom. 9. in Josuam. §. 4.*

He is speaking of that text, Joshua viii. 33, how Joshua wrote a copy of the law of Moses on the stones of the altar: and that he did it *in the presence of the children of Israel*. And in allusion to this, speaking of our Saviour's writing his law, not on stones, but in the hearts of his disciples, he finds this way to prove that this also is done *in the presence of the children of Israel*. He says that the word *Israel* signifies *a mind that sees God*; and that that definition fits well to angels: and that the angels are to be thought to be present at the giving of the holy sacraments. And then he adds:

‘Secundum Domini sententiam dicentis de infantibus (quod et tu fuisti infans in baptismo) *quia angeli eorum semper vident faciem Patris mei qui in cælis est*. Coram istis igitur filiis Israel qui aderant illo in tempore cum tibi fidei sacramenta tradebantur, videntibus faciem Dei, Jesus in corde tuo deuteronomium scripsit.’

‘According to that saying of our Lord concerning

CHAP.V. ‘ infants, (and thou wast an infant when thou wast  
 110. ‘ baptized,) *their angels do always behold the face*  
 (A.D.210.) ‘ *of my Father which is in heaven.* So then Jesus  
 ‘ wrote his law in thy heart in the presence of those  
 ‘ children of Israel, beholders of God’s face, at the  
 ‘ time when the sacrament of faith was given thee.’

All that is doubtful in this place too, is, whether when he says, ‘ Thou wast an infant when thou wast ‘ baptized,’ he mean an infant in age, or only an infant in the foresaid spiritual sense. Erasmus takes it in the former sense, for in his edition of Origen’s works, he, or else Grynæus the editor, sets in the margin of that place, the word *pædobaptismus*.

Though this part of Origen’s works be not extant in Greek, yet we may the more depend upon it, because Rufinus assures us, that in the translation of these Homilies, and those on Judges, he has neither added nor omitted any thing, but truly rendered what he found in the Greek books. *Perorat. in Hom. ad Romanos.*

X. But whatever be determined concerning the sense, or concerning the authenticity of this, or of any other one particular saying of Origen ; that he in his books did generally speak of baptism as given to infants, is plain by this : that St. Hierome (who was of all the Latin fathers the greatest reader of Origen’s works in their original language) does acquaint us, both that he did so, and also that he built his false hypothesis of the preexistence of souls on this ground partly ; that by it he might give the better account of the sins for which an infant is baptized. For St. Hierome in his Third Dialogue against the Pelagians, having upbraided them that they could not apprehend what the scripture teaches



of original sin in infants, as derived from Adam, for CHAP.V.  
 the forgiveness whereof they should be baptized, 110.  
 says to them in the last words of that book : (A.D. 210.)

‘ Quod si injusta vobis videtur alienorum remissio  
 ‘ peccatorum ; qua non indiget, qui peccare non po-  
 ‘ tuit : transite ad Amasium vestrum, qui præterita  
 ‘ in cœlis et antiqua delicta solvi dicit in baptismo.  
 ‘ Ut cujus in cæteris auctoritate ducimini, etiam in  
 ‘ hac parte errorem sequamini<sup>f</sup>.’

‘ And if the forgiveness of sins, which are the  
 ‘ sins of another, do seem to you unjust, or such as  
 ‘ he [an infant] that could commit no sin himself,  
 ‘ has no need of ; then march over to your beloved  
 ‘ [plainly meaning Origen], who holds that in baptism  
 ‘ are forgiven those sins which have been committed  
 ‘ in a former state in the celestial regions : and  
 ‘ as you are influenced by his authority in your  
 ‘ other points, partake of his error in this too.’ The  
 place, with the context, I must recite hereafter, ch.  
 xxix. §. 26.

XI. Now Origen, or any other ancient, mentioning  
 a practice as received, and giving a false ground for  
 it, is as good a witness of the practice itself as the  
 most orthodox mentioner of it.

If there were found in these translations of Origen  
 but one or two places, and those in Rufinus alone,  
 that did speak of infant baptism ; there might have  
 been suspicion of their being interpolations. But  
 when there are so many of them, brought in on  
 several occasions, in translations made by several  
 men, who were of several parties and enemies to one  
 another, (as St. Hierome and Rufinus were,) and  
 upon no tentation (for it is certain that in their

<sup>f</sup> Opera, tom. ii. p. 792.

CHAP. V. time there was no dispute about infant baptism) that  
 110.  
 (A.D. 210.) they should be all without any reason forged, is  
 absurd to think.

Especially if we consider that these translators lived not much more than an hundred years after Origen's time; and the Christians then must know whether infants had been used to be baptized in Origen's time, or not; the very tradition from father to son must have carried a memory of it for so short a time. And then, for them to make Origen speak of a thing which all the world knew was not in use in his time, must have made them ridiculous.

And besides, in the Greek remains there are sentences and expressions so like and parallel to those which I have here brought translations of, and citations of texts of scripture applied so much to the same purpose, that they do confirm these to be genuine translations. I will recite one of them, (which I have observed since the last edition,) which though it has not in so express words as the other, the particular mention of giving baptism to infants; yet the reader will see that it supposes it to be necessary for them. It is in his

*Comment. in Matt. tom. xv. p. 391. ed. Huetii.*

(§. 22, 23, ed. Benedict.)

He is there commenting on that answer of our Saviour to St. Peter's question, Matth. xix. 28, *Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, shall sit upon twelve thrones, &c.* He says, that by the regeneration in this place is meant the time of the resurrection of the dead. Ταύτην λήψονται τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν νεκρῶν. Αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ παλιγγενεσία, καὶνὴ τις γένεσις οὐσα, ὅτε οὐρανὸς καὶνὸς καὶ ἡ

γῆ καινῇ, &c. ‘This power they are to receive at the resurrection of the dead. For that is a regeneration, being a new generation [or birth], when a new heaven and a new earth are made,’ &c. And he adds, ἐκείνης δὲ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας προοίμιόν ἐστι, τὸ καλούμενον παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, &c. ‘And the way [or preparative, or prerequisite] to that regeneration [in the world to come] is that which by Paul is called the laver [or washing] of regeneration,’ &c. Then follow these words :

CHAP. V.

110.

(A.D. 210.)

Τάχα δὲ καὶ κατὰ μὲν τὴν γένεσιν οὐδεὶς ἐστὶ καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, οὐδ’ εἰ μία ἡμέρα εἴη ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τὸ περὶ τῆς γενέσεως μυστήριον, ἐφ’ ἧ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ Δαβὶδ ἐν πεντηκοστῷ ψάλλω λελεγμένον, ἕκαστος πάντων εἰς γένεσιν ἐληλυθότων λέγει, ἔχον οὕτως· “Ὅτι ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἀμαρτίαις ἐκίσσησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου.

Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίαν πᾶς μὲν καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἄνωθεν, ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος· ἵνα τολμήσας εἴπω, καθαρὸς δι’ ἐσόπτρου καὶ ἐν αἰνίγματι. Κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἄλλην παλιγγενεσίαν, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, πᾶς ὁ εἰς τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ παλιγγενεσίαν ἐκείνην φθάσας καθαρώτατός ἐστιν ἀπὸ ῥύπου πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον, καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας φθάνων ἐπ’ ἐκείνην τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν.

‘There is perhaps in our generation [or first birth] none clean from pollution though his life be but of one day; because of the mystery of our generation [or birth], in respect of which every one of all that are born, may say that which was said by David in the fiftieth psalm; which was this, *I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.*

‘But in the regeneration [or new birth] by the laver [or baptism] every one that is born again of



CHAP.V. ‘ water and the Spirit, is clean from pollution ;  
110. ‘ clean (as I may venture to say) as *by a glass*  
 (A.D.210.) ‘ *darkly.*

‘ And in that other regeneration, *when the Son of*  
 ‘ *man shall sit on the throne of his glory,* every one  
 ‘ that attains to that regeneration in Christ, is clean  
 ‘ from pollution in the highest degree. *Face to face.*  
 ‘ And it is by the washing of regeneration that he  
 ‘ comes to that other regeneration.’

If any reader compare this passage, or the other, which I cited before out of the book *Contra Celsum*, with those quotations of St. Hierome’s and Rufinus’s translation ; the likeness of the notions, of the style, of the chain of thought and method of arguing in each, will incline him to take them all to be of the same author, besides the proofs I gave before.

I think it is not less than forty times that Origen in his remaining Greek works does cite that text of Job xiv. which in the Septuagint translation is as he recites it, *None is free from pollution, though his life be but of one day.* Which is also cited there in both the translations of Hierome and Rufinus ; and in many other places of their translations.

And as it is said in the translations, ‘ This natural pollution of sin must be done away by water and the Spirit ;’ so it is said to the same purpose here, that that pollution which infects every one from his first generation, so as that an infant, one day old, is not free from it, is cleansed in a good degree by the regeneration of baptism in this world ; and perfectly at that great regeneration or restitution of all things which shall be in the world to come.

And (what I would chiefly remark) that this

washing of regeneration [the baptismal regeneration in this world] is the *προοίμιον*, the beginning, or way to, or preparative, or prerequisite, of that in the other world. And that it is by this, that any one *φθάει* does come to, or arrive at, that.

CHAP.V.

110.

(A.D.210.)

There are in all writers, and in all books, some sayings or rules, in which, though they are expressed in general and comprehensive terms, yet infants are not meant to be included. But that cannot be supposed here, because he mentions their case particularly; and the discourse begins with speaking of their state from their birth, and from the time that they are but one day old. And when he says, that for all that are born the *προοίμιον*, whereby they may come at the future great regeneration, is baptism in this life; though he do not here, as in the other places, express that their baptism must be in infancy; yet the nature of his argument supposes it. For if it be necessary for all who do pass from the original polluted state to that state of perfect purity, that they have this intermediate cleansing; Origen knew that nigh half of the persons born into the world must have it in infancy, if at all; because they never come to adult age.

This notion of three several births, or generations, to every Christian, is common among ecclesiastical writers. I shall have occasion to cite a passage of Gregory Nazianzen speaking in the same manner. The first, his natural birth, the entrance into a polluted state. The second, his baptism, a new birth, or entrance into a cleansed state, a state of salvation. The third, his resurrection, his last and great new birth, an entrance into a glorified state. They call the third, as well as the second, a regeneration. And it is

CHAP. V. so in the highest sense of the word. Therefore when  
 110.  
 (A.D. 210.) I say, that when they use the word, they always mean, or connote baptism; I hope every reader perceives my meaning to be, that when they use that word in relation to the spiritual concerns of any person in this life, they do always refer to his baptism. For I own that the regeneration that is to be in the other life, is quite another thing.

XII. There is one circumstance that makes Origen a more competent witness to give evidence, whether the baptizing of infants had been in use time out of mind or not, than most other authors that we have left to us of that age; because he was himself of a family that had been Christian for a long time. Tertullian and all the rest that we have mentioned, except Irenæus, must have been themselves baptized in adult age; because they were of heathen parents, and were the first of their family that turned Christians: but Origen's father was a martyr for Christ in the persecution under Severus, the year after the apostles 102. And Eusebius<sup>g</sup> assures us, that his forefathers had been Christians for several generations; τῷ τε γὰρ Ὀριγένει τὰ τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν διδασκαλίας ἐκ προγόνων ἐσώζετο. 'The Christian doctrine ' was conveyed to him from his forefathers.' Or, as Rufinus<sup>h</sup> translates it, *ab avis atque atavis*, 'from his ' grandfathers and great-grandfathers.'

That which gave occasion to Eusebius to inquire into his pedigree, was the slander of Porphyrius: for he endeavouring to shew that the Christian religion had nothing in it of learning or science, and had none but illiterate followers; and not being able to deny or conceal the great repute of Origen for

<sup>g</sup> Eccl. Hist. lib. vi. c. 19.

<sup>h</sup> Lib. vi. c. 14.



his skill in human literature, had feigned that he was at first a heathen, and having learned their philosophy, and then turning Christian, had endeavoured to transfer and apply it to trim up the Christian fables. In confutation of this lie, Eusebius, as I said, sets forth his Christian descent.

CHAP. V.  
110.  
(A.D. 210.)

Now since Origen was born anno 185, that is, the year after the apostles, 85, (for he was seventeen years old when his father suffered,) his grandfather, or at least his great-grandfather, must have lived in the apostles' time. And as he could not be ignorant whether he was himself baptized in infancy, so he had no further than his own family to go for inquiry how it was practised in the times of the apostles.

Besides that, he was, as I said, a very learned man, and could not be ignorant of the use of the churches; in most of which he had also travelled; for as he was born and bred at Alexandria, so it appears out of Eusebius<sup>h</sup>, that he had lived in Greece, and at Rome, and in Cappadocia, and Arabia, and spent the main part of his life in Syria and Palestine.

## CHAP. VI.

*Quotations out of St. Cyprian.*

*Cypriani Epist. 64. (Pamelii et Benedict. editt. 59.)  
ad Fidum.*

§. I. ST. CYPRIAN was bishop of Carthage. And it was the custom in that, as in all other great and metropolitical cities, for the neighbouring bishops

150.  
(A.D. 250.)

<sup>h</sup> H. E. lib. vi.

CHAP. VI. to meet there at certain times to consult of and  
 150. determine any emergent affairs of the church.

(A.D. 250.) At this time, anno Dom. 253, there were 66 of them in council. And one Fidus, a country bishop, had sent a letter with two cases, in which he desired their resolution; which they give in this epistle to him.

One being about one Victor a presbyter, that after a crime committed, had, by the rashness of a certain bishop, been admitted too soon to absolution, is nothing to our concern.

The other question being, whether an infant, before it was eight days old, might be baptized, if need required: I shall recite so much of the letter as concerns that.

*‘ Cyprianus et cæteri Collegæ, qui in Concilio af-  
 fuerunt, numero 66. Fido fratri salutem.*

*‘ Legimus litteras tuas, frater carissime, quibus  
 ‘ significasti de Victore quondam presbytero, &c. . . .  
 ‘ Quantum vero ad causam infantium pertinet, quos  
 ‘ dixisti, intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati  
 ‘ sunt, constitutos baptizari non oportere: et con-  
 ‘ siderandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquæ; ut  
 ‘ intra octavum diem, eum, qui natus est, baptizan-  
 ‘ dum et sanctificandum non putares, longe aliud in  
 ‘ concilio nostro omnibus visum est. In hoc enim,  
 ‘ quod tu putabas esse faciendum, nemo consensit:  
 ‘ sed universi potius judicavimus nulli homini nato  
 ‘ misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam. Nam  
 ‘ cum Dominus in evangelio suo dicat, *Filius homi-  
 ‘ nis non venit animas hominum perdere, sed salvare;*  
 ‘ quantum in nobis est, si fieri potest, nulla anima  
 ‘ perdenda est. Quid enim ei deest, qui semel in  
 ‘ utero Dei manibus formatus est? Nobis enim*

‘ atque oculis nostris secundum dierum sæcularium CHAP.VI.  
 ‘ cursum accipere qui nati sunt, incrementum viden-  
 ‘ tur. Ceterum quæcunque a Deo fiunt, Dei factoris <sup>150.</sup> (A.D. 250.)  
 ‘ majestate et opere perfecta sunt. Esse denique  
 ‘ apud omnes, sive infantes, sive majores natu, unam  
 ‘ divini muneris æqualitatem, declarat nobis divinæ  
 ‘ scripturæ fides. Helisæus super infantem [Sun-  
 ‘ mitidis] viduæ filium qui mortuus jacebat, ita se  
 ‘ Deum deprecans superstravit, ut capiti caput et  
 ‘ faciei facies applicaretur, et superfusi Helisæi  
 ‘ membra singulis parvuli membris, et pedes pedibus  
 ‘ jungerentur. Quæ res si secundum nativitatis  
 ‘ nostræ et corporis inæqualitatem cogitetur, adulto  
 ‘ et provecto infans non posset æquari, nec cohærere  
 ‘ et sufficere possent parva membra majoribus. Sed  
 ‘ illic æqualitas divina et spiritalis exprimitur, quod  
 ‘ pares atque æquales sint omnes homines, quando a  
 ‘ Deo semel facti sunt, et possit ætas nostra in in-  
 ‘ crementis corporis secundum sæculum, non secun-  
 ‘ dum Deum habere discrimen. Nisi si et gratia  
 ‘ ipsa, quæ baptizatis datur, pro ætate accipientium,  
 ‘ vel minor, vel major tribuitur; cum spiritus sanc-  
 ‘ tus non de mensura, sed de pietate atque indul-  
 ‘ gentia paterna æqualis omnibus præbeatur. Nam  
 ‘ Deus ut personam non accipit, sic nec ætatem:  
 ‘ cum se omnibus ad cœlestis gratiæ consecutionem  
 ‘ æqualitate librata præbeat patrem. Nam et quod  
 ‘ vestigium infantis, in primis partus sui diebus con-  
 ‘ stituti, mundum non esse dixisti, quod unusquisque  
 ‘ nostrum adhuc horreat exosculari: nec hoc puta-  
 ‘ mus ad cœlestem gratiam dandam impedimento  
 ‘ esse oportere. Scriptum est enim, omnia munda  
 ‘ sunt mundis: nec aliquis nostrum id debet hor-  
 ‘ rere, quod Deus dignatus est facere. Nam etsi



CHAP. VI. ‘ adhuc infans a partu novus est, non ita est tamen,  
 150. ‘ ut quisquam illum, in gratia danda atque in pace  
 (A.D. 250.) ‘ facienda, horrere debeat osculari : quando in osculo  
 ‘ infantis unusquisque nostrum pro sua religione  
 ‘ ipsas adhuc recentes Dei manus debeat cogitare ;  
 ‘ quas in homine modo formato et recens nato quo-  
 ‘ dammodo exosculamur, quando id quod Deus facit  
 ‘ amplectimur. Nam quod in Judaica circumcissione  
 ‘ carnali octavus dies observabatur, sacramentum est  
 ‘ in umbra atque in imagine ante præmissum, sed  
 ‘ veniente Christo veritate completum : nam quia oc-  
 ‘ tavus dies, i. e. post sabbatum primus, dies futurus  
 ‘ erat, quo Dominus resurgeret, et nos vivificaret, et  
 ‘ circumcisionem nobis spiritalem daret : hic dies  
 ‘ octavus i. e. post sabbatum primus et Dominicus  
 ‘ præcessit in imagine ; quæ imago cessavit superven-  
 ‘ niente postmodum veritate, et data nobis spiritali  
 ‘ circumcissione. Propter quod neminem putamus a  
 ‘ gratia consequenda impediendum esse ea lege quæ  
 ‘ jam statuta est, nec spiritalem circumcisionem im-  
 ‘ pediri carnali circumcissione debere : sed omnem  
 ‘ omnino hominem admittendum esse ad gratiam  
 ‘ Christi : quando et Petrus in Actis Apostolorum  
 ‘ loquatur et dicat, *Dominus mihi dixit neminem ho-*  
 ‘ *minum communem dicendum et immundum.* Cete-  
 ‘ rum si homines impedire aliquid ad consecutionem  
 ‘ gratiæ posset ; magis adultos et provectos et ma-  
 ‘ jores natu possent impedire peccata graviora. Porro  
 ‘ autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus, et in Deum  
 ‘ multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint,  
 ‘ remissa peccatorum datur, et a baptismo atque a  
 ‘ gratia nemo prohibetur : quanto magis prohiberi  
 ‘ non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit,  
 ‘ nisi quod, secundum Adam carnaliter natus, conta-

‘gium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contraxit? CHAP.VI.  
 ‘qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipso <sup>150.</sup>  
 ‘facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria, (A.D.250.)  
 ‘sed aliena peccata. Et idcirco, frater carissime,  
 ‘hæc fuit in concilio nostra sententia, a baptismo  
 ‘atque a gratia Dei, qui omnibus misericors et be-  
 ‘nignus et pius est, neminem per nos debere prohi-  
 ‘beri. Quod cum circa universos observandum sit  
 ‘atque retinendum; tum magis circa infantes ipsos  
 ‘et recens natos observandum putamus, qui hoc ipso  
 ‘de ope nostra ac de divina misericordia plus me-  
 ‘rentur, quod in primo statim nativitatis suæ ortu  
 ‘plorantes ac flentes, nihil aliud faciunt quam depre-  
 ‘cantur. Optamus te, frater carissime, semper bene  
 ‘valere.’

‘*Cyprian and the rest of the bishops who were pre-  
 ‘sent at the council, sixty-six in number, to Fidus  
 ‘our brother, greeting.*

‘We read your letter, most dear brother, in which  
 ‘you write of one Victor a priest, &c. . . . But as  
 ‘to the case of infants: whereas you judge that they  
 ‘must not be baptized within two or three days  
 ‘after they are born; and that the rule of circum-  
 ‘cision is to be observed, so that none should be  
 ‘baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after  
 ‘he is born: we were all in our assembly of the  
 ‘contrary opinion. For as for what you thought  
 ‘fitting to be done, there was not one that was of  
 ‘your mind, but all of us on the contrary, judged  
 ‘that the grace and mercy of God is to be denied to  
 ‘no person that is born. For whereas our Lord in  
 ‘his gospel says, *The Son of Man came not to de-  
 ‘stroy men’s souls [or lives] but to save them*: as far  
 ‘as lies in us, no soul, if possible, is to be lost.

CHAP. VI. ‘ For what is there deficient in him who has been  
 150.  
 (A.D. 250.) ‘ once formed in the womb by the hands of God ?  
 ‘ They appear to us and in our eyes to attain per-  
 ‘ fection [or increase] in the course of the days of  
 ‘ the world ; but all things that are made by God  
 ‘ are perfect by the work and power of God their  
 ‘ maker. The scripture gives us to understand the  
 ‘ equality of the divine gift on all, whether infants  
 ‘ or grown persons. Elisha, in his prayer to God,  
 ‘ stretched himself on the infant son of the Shuna-  
 ‘ mite woman that lay dead, in such manner that  
 ‘ his head, and face, and limbs, and feet were ap-  
 ‘ plied to the head, face, limbs, and feet of the child ;  
 ‘ which, if it be understood according to the quality  
 ‘ of our body and nature, the infant could not hold  
 ‘ measure with the grown man, nor its little limbs  
 ‘ fit and reach to his great ones. But in that place  
 ‘ a spiritual equality, and such as is in the esteem of  
 ‘ God, is intimated to us ; by which persons that  
 ‘ are once made by God are alike and equal ; and  
 ‘ our growth of body by age makes a difference in  
 ‘ the sense of the world, but not of God. Unless  
 ‘ you will think that the grace itself, which is given  
 ‘ to baptized persons, is greater or less, according to  
 ‘ the age of those that receive it ; whereas the Holy  
 ‘ Spirit is given not by different measures, but with  
 ‘ fatherly affection and kindness equal to all. For  
 ‘ God, as he accepts no one’s person, so not his age ;  
 ‘ but with an exact equality shews himself a father  
 ‘ to all for their obtaining the heavenly grace.

‘ And whereas you say, that an infant in the first  
 ‘ days after its birth is unclean, so that any of us  
 ‘ abhors to kiss it. We think not this neither to be  
 ‘ any reason to hinder the giving to it the heavenly



‘ grace. For it is written, *to the clean all things* CHAP.VI.  
 ‘ *are clean*: nor ought any of us to abhor that 150.  
 ‘ which God has vouchsafed to make. Though an (A.D. 250.)  
 ‘ infant come fresh from the womb, no one ought to  
 ‘ abhor to kiss it at the giving of the grace and the  
 ‘ owning of the peace [or brotherhood,] when as in  
 ‘ kissing the infant, every one of us ought, out of  
 ‘ devotion, to think of the fresh handywork of God :  
 ‘ for we do in some sense kiss his hands in the per-  
 ‘ son newly formed and but new born, when we em-  
 ‘ brace that which is of his making.

‘ That the eighth day was observed in the Jewish  
 ‘ circumcision, was a type going before in a shadow  
 ‘ and resemblance ; but on Christ’s coming was ful-  
 ‘ filled in the substance. For because the eighth  
 ‘ day, that is, the next to the sabbath-day, was to  
 ‘ be the day on which the Lord was to rise from the  
 ‘ dead and quicken us, and give us the spiritual cir-  
 ‘ cumcision ; this eighth day, that is, the next day  
 ‘ to the sabbath, or Lord’s day, was signified in the  
 ‘ type before ; which type ceased when the sub-  
 ‘ stance came, and the spiritual circumcision was  
 ‘ given to us.

‘ So that we judge that no person is to be hin-  
 ‘ dered from obtaining the grace, by the law that is  
 ‘ now appointed ; and that the spiritual circumcision  
 ‘ ought not to be restrained by the circumcision that  
 ‘ was according to the flesh : but that all are to be ad-  
 ‘ mitted to the grace of Christ ; since Peter, speaking  
 ‘ in the Acts of the Apostles, says, *The Lord has shewn*  
 ‘ *me that no person is to be called common or unclean.*

‘ If any thing could be an obstacle to persons  
 ‘ against their obtaining the grace, the adult and  
 ‘ grown and elder men would be rather hindered

CHAP. VI. ‘ by their more grievous sins. If then the greatest  
 150. ‘ offenders, and they that have grievously sinned  
 (A.D. 250.) ‘ against God before, have when they afterward  
 ‘ come to believe, forgiveness of their sins ; and no  
 ‘ person is kept off from baptism and the grace :  
 ‘ how much less reason is there to refuse an infant,  
 ‘ who, being newly born, has no sin, save that being  
 ‘ descended from Adam according to the flesh, he  
 ‘ has from his very birth contracted the contagion  
 ‘ of the death anciently threatened : who comes for  
 ‘ this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of  
 ‘ sins, because they are not his own but others’  
 ‘ sins that are forgiven him.

‘ This, therefore, dear brother, was our opinion  
 ‘ in the assembly ; that it is not for us to hinder  
 ‘ any person from baptism and the grace of God,  
 ‘ who is merciful and kind and affectionate to  
 ‘ all. Which rule, as it holds for all, so we think  
 ‘ it more especially to be observed in reference to  
 ‘ infants and persons newly born : to whom our  
 ‘ help and the divine mercy is rather to be granted,  
 ‘ because by their weeping and wailing at their first  
 ‘ entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing  
 ‘ so much as that they implore compassion.

‘ Dear brother, we wish you always good health.’

It is not denied by any but that this is a plain proof of infants’ baptism being taken for granted at that time : since both Fidus, who puts the question, and the council that resolve it, do shew by their words their sense to be that they are to be baptized in infancy ; only Fidus thought not before the eighth day.

Mr. Tombes, who makes some exceptions against the foregoing testimonies, as not being plain declarations of the author’s mind, or not certainly genuine,

(but yet no other exceptions than what I have men-  
tioned,) grants this to be plain, and to ‘say enough,  
‘and more than enough, except it had spoke more  
‘to the purpose, and would have it pass for the  
‘spring head of infant baptism<sup>i</sup>.’

II. But there is one antipædobaptist writer, a man of more boldness in his assertions than the rest, that would represent this as a forged or supposititious piece. ‘We would rather believe,’ says he, ‘that these things were foisted into his writings by that villainous cursed generation, that so horribly abused the writings of most of the ancients<sup>k</sup>.’

But as Mr. Tombes was more wary and learned than to object any such thing, so there could not have been any thing more unluckily pleaded. For so it happens, that in all antiquity there is not any one piece that can more certainly be proved to be genuine than this: because it is so often quoted by St. Hierome and St. Austin, that lived a while after; not in any question of infant baptism, but of original sin, which the Pelagians denied, though they, as I shall shew hereafter, granted and practised infant baptism. I shall have occasion in the following chapters to cite some of the passages of the foresaid fathers where they mention this epistle of St. Cyprian, and at present shall refer the reader to such places of St. Austin, where he transcribes large passages verbatim out of it, so as to recite it by parcels almost all.

In his Ep. 28. ad Hieronym. he, speaking of some that taught that the body only, and not the soul, must suffer for original sin, says among other

<sup>i</sup> Examen, p. 10, 11.

<sup>k</sup> H. Danvers, Treatise of Baptism, part ii. c. 3. 8vo. 1674.



CHAP. VI. things this : ‘ Blessed Cyprian, not making any new  
 150. ‘ decree, but expressing the firm faith of the church,  
 (A.D. 250.) ‘ in refuting those that thought a child must not be  
 ‘ baptized before the eighth day, said (not that no  
 ‘ flesh, but) that no soul must be lost.’

And lib. 4. *contra duas Epist. Pelagianorum*, cap. 8, he recites three large passages out of it.

And lib. 3. *De Peccatorum meritis et remissione*, c. 5, having mentioned this epistle, he tells Marcellinus, the nobleman, to whom he writes, ‘ You may, ‘ if you please, read the epistle itself of the said ‘ martyr about the baptizing of infants : for there is ‘ no doubt but it is to be had at Carthage. However, ‘ I have thought fit to transcribe some part of it, as ‘ much as is necessary for our present question,’ [which was about original sin.] So he begins where I began ; ‘ but as to the case of infants : whereas ‘ you judge they must not be baptized within two or ‘ three days,’ &c. and goes on to repeat two large paragraphs verbatim out of it.

Also having occasion to <sup>1</sup>preach at Carthage against Pelagianism, he, towards the end of his sermon, recites to the people some part of this epistle, telling them, that ‘ they are the words of Cyprian, ‘ an ancient bishop of that see.’ ‘ Holy Cyprian,’ says he, ‘ was asked whether an infant might be ‘ baptized before the eighth day, because in the old ‘ law it was not lawful to circumcise but on the ‘ eighth day. The question was of the day of baptizing, for of original sin there was no question : ‘ and therefore from a thing of which there was no ‘ question, the question that was started was resolved. ‘ St. Cyprian said, among other things, “ So that

<sup>1</sup> Serm. 14. de Verbis Apost.

‘ we judge that no person is to be hindered from CHAP.VI.  
 ‘ obtaining the grace, &c. [proceeding to those words] 150.  
 ‘ because they are not his own but others’ sins that (A.D. 250.)  
 ‘ are forgiven him.” See how he, making no doubt  
 ‘ of this matter [viz. of original sin] solves that of  
 ‘ which there was doubt; he took this from the  
 ‘ foundation of the church to fasten a stone that  
 ‘ was loose.’

St. Hierome also quotes a good part of it verbatim,  
 l. iii. *Dialog. adv. Pelag.*

III. Since then it is plain that it was at that time,  
 and in those places where St. Cyprian had lived com-  
 monly known for his, and frequent in the hands of  
 learned men; there is the less need of considering  
 those objections which are brought as probable  
 against its being genuine.

The aforesaid author says, ‘ We meet with no  
 ‘ such council, neither can it appear where it was  
 ‘ held.’

But this is to make himself more ignorant than  
 he is, as if he did not know that the date of this is  
 before those times, in which the acts of the councils  
 used to be registered and collected into volumes : so  
 that this had been lost, if it had not been preserved  
 among the epistles of this father. And besides,  
 that they never used to put into the volumes of  
 councils the acts of those ordinary assemblies in  
 which the neighbouring bishops met every half year  
 at the principal city, (whereof this was one, viz. St.  
 Cyprian’s neighbouring colleagues assembled at Car-  
 thage,) but only those in which some extraordinary  
 matter was handled.

IV. Yet this is proper to observe here, that  
 whereas Grotius would prove that ‘ infant baptism

CHAP. VI. ‘ was not universally held to be necessary, because  
<sup>150.</sup>  
 (A.D. 250.) ‘ in the councils one finds no earlier mention of it  
 ‘ than in the council of Carthage<sup>m</sup>,’ meaning that in  
 the year 418. We see here that though that were  
 true, (which I shall by and by shew to be false<sup>n</sup>,) that  
 there were no earlier mention of it in those councils  
 that are in the ordinary collections; yet there is  
 mention of it in this, that was earlier than any of  
 them; and though met on ordinary occasions, more  
 numerous than several of them.

V. It is objected, likewise, that whereas St. Austin  
 somewhere lays down this as a rule, that ‘ what the  
 ‘ whole church through all the world does practise,  
 ‘ and yet it has not been instituted in councils, but  
 ‘ has been always in use, is with very good reason  
 ‘ supposed to have been settled by authority of the  
 ‘ apostles<sup>o</sup>,’ and applies that rule to infant baptism;  
 he consequently takes it not to have been instituted  
 by any council; and therefore that he contradicts  
 himself when he believes there was such a council  
 as this letter mentions.

But there needs nothing but for a man to open  
 his eyes to see that this council does not institute  
 the baptism of infants, or enact that they should be  
 baptized; but takes that for granted, or as a thing  
 known and supposed by both parties, that they are  
 to be baptized: and determines only that question,  
 whether they may be baptized before the eighth  
 day. Which very thing St. Austin notes in the  
 words I just now cited, Ep. 28. ‘ Cyprian not making  
 ‘ any new decree,’ &c.

VI. Another exception that is made has, I think,

<sup>m</sup> Annot. in Matt. 19.

<sup>n</sup> Ch. xvi.

<sup>o</sup> De Baptismo contra Donatistas, lib. iv. c. 23.



some truth in it, viz. That some of the reasons used CHAP. VI.  
 in this council, and expressed in this letter, do appear 150.  
 something frivolous and shallow. But I do not see (A. D. 250.)  
 how it is at all to the purpose.

1. Because these reasons are not designed to prove infant baptism, but to take off the objections concerning the eighth day.

2. If they had been used by these bishops as grounds of infant baptism ; yet since our inquiry is what the church then practised, and not how able St. Cyprian and they were to argue ; their evidence is the same, how weak soever their reasonings are. But,

3. This also may be said in apology for their abilities ; that to a frivolous and foolish question or objection, it is almost impossible to give any answer that will not seem frivolous to those that consider not the occasion of it. On this account Irenæus and many of the fathers suffer in our judgment ; they are forced to write a great deal in confutation of such idle and enthusiastical stuff as seems to us not to deserve three words : but it was necessary then to disentangle the souls of ignorant Christians. So any book written now in answer to the reasonings of the Quakers, &c., will in the next age seem to be the work of a man that had little to do. This Fidus thought that the natural uncleanness of an infant in the first days after his birth was a reason against baptizing it then ; which, as Rigaltius observes, was a relick of heathenish superstition. He also seems to have made some question whether so young an infant be a perfect human creature ; as if eight days made any great difference in that matter.

CHAP. VI. The answers to such arguments will seem of little weight. All that he objected of sense was the <sup>150.</sup> rule of circumcision on the eighth day. To which St. Cyprian answers, as other fathers do, that the circumstance of the day was typical, and so not now obliging.

(A.D. 250.)

VII. If we look back from this time to the space that had passed from the apostles' time, which was but 150 years; we must conclude that it was easy then to know the practice of Christians in the apostles' days. For some of these sixty-six bishops must be thought to be at this time 70 or 80 years old themselves, which reaches to half the space: and at that time when they were infants, there must have been several alive that were born within the apostles' age. And such could not be ignorant whether infants were baptized in that age, when they themselves were some of those infants.

It is plain likewise that there was no dispute or difference of opinion (as there must have been among so many, if any innovation had been made.) For it is here said, 'there was not one of Fidus' 'mind,' that infant baptism must be delayed till the eighth day. Much less then was there any of opinion that it was not to be used at all.

'In a doctrinal point,' as Mr. Baxter well observes, 'a mistake is easier, or in a bare narration of some one fact: but in a matter of fact of so public notice, and which so many thousands were partakers in, as baptism was, how could they be ignorant?'

Suppose it were a question now among us, whether persons were baptized at age only, or in infancy also,

70 or 80 years before we were born : were it not easy CHAP. VI.  
 to know the truth, what by tradition, and what by 150.  
 records? (A.D. 250.)

VIII. I shall conclude what I have to note on this testimony with observing these things :

1. That it was the custom of those times and places to give the new-baptized person, whether infant or adult, the kiss of peace, or as it is called by St. Peter<sup>p</sup> and St. Paul<sup>q</sup>, the *holy kiss*, or the *kiss of charity*, in token of their owning him for a Christian brother : for Fidus makes that a part of his objection, that that would be indecent or loathsome in the case of a new-born infant, before it be a week old.

IX. 2. That these bishops held, that to suffer the infant to die unbaptized was to endanger its salvation. This appears in their reasonings.

X. 3. The third is a various reading or spelling of one word in this epistle, from whence some disputes have arisen. Mr. Daillé, in a book written on purpose to publish the *Nævi* and errors which he could find in the fathers' works<sup>r</sup>, reckons St. Cyprian one of the first of those from whose words one may prove there was a custom of giving the holy communion to infants. And he proves it first and chiefly from this epistle, in which, as it is here written, there is never a word about it. But where we read in the first clause of it, *baptizandum et sanctificandum*, 'should be baptized and sanctified,' (which latter word is commonly used as another word for baptism,) he quotes it, *baptizandum et sacrificandum*, by which he understands, 'should be baptized and

<sup>p</sup> 1 Cor. xvi. 20.

<sup>q</sup> 1 Pet. v. 14.

<sup>r</sup> De Usu Patrum, l. ii. c. 4. [4to. Geneva, 1656. There is an English version, printed in 1651.]



CHAP. VI. ‘partake of the eucharist.’ Some editions, it seems, have it so; but, I suppose, very few: and those <sup>150.</sup> (A.D. 250.) mistaken ones. For Dr. Hammond<sup>s</sup>, Marshall<sup>t</sup>, and the Magdeburgenses<sup>u</sup>, and Mr. Walker, and all that I have seen, do quote it *sanctificandum*, as it is also in the last edition, viz. Oxon, 1682<sup>x</sup>, in which are the various lections of several manuscripts that had been collated: but no variety in reading of this word. And the matter is out of doubt; since St. Austin, transcribing that part of the epistle<sup>y</sup>, writes it *sanctificandum*. And indeed *sacrificandum* in that sense is not Latin.

From this use of the word *sanctification* for *baptism*, and *sanctified* or *made holy* for *baptized*, (which I shall shew<sup>z</sup> hereafter to have been very common and usual,) the fathers do give light to the explication of that text of St. Paul 1 Cor. vii. 14; as I shall more fully shew at a fitter place<sup>z</sup>.

4. We see also here confirmed, what I said<sup>a</sup> before, that they reckoned baptism to be to us in the room of circumcision. For it was upon that account, that Fidus thought it must keep the times of the old circumcision: and the bishops of the council, though denying that, do call it ‘the spiritual [or Christian] ‘circumcision.’

<sup>s</sup> Six Queries, Inf. Bapt. §. 36.

<sup>t</sup> [A Defence of Infant Baptism, in answer to two treatises and an appendix lately published by Mr. Jo. Tombes; by Steven Marshall, B. D. 4to. 1646, p. 39.]

<sup>u</sup> [The Centuriators, or authors of the ‘Centuriæ Magdeburgenses,’ folio.]

<sup>x</sup> [So likewise in the Benedictine edition, Paris, 1726.]

<sup>y</sup> Lib. iv. contra duas Epist. Pelagianorum, c. 8.

<sup>z</sup> Ch. xi. sect. 9.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. ii. sect. 2.

Another passage out of St. Cyprian.

CHAP. VI.

*Libro de Lapsis, circa Medium.* (pag. 183. edit.

Benedict. 1726.)

<sup>150.</sup>  
(A.D. 250.)

XI. There had been at Carthage a great persecution of the Christians, in which many had fallen, and had denied their religion, and had joined in the idolatrous sacrifices: some of which afterward, when the persecution was over, went about to crowd themselves into the church, without giving first any sufficient proofs of their repentance for so horrid a crime, or expecting the consent of the church for their readmission. St. Cyprian thought it necessary for these men to be first made sensible of the guilt they had contracted: for which purpose he writes this book; and has, among others, this passage, in which he mentions their infants; and though there be no express mention of their baptism, yet you will see it is in other words plainly described.

‘ Nonne, quando ad Capitolium sponte ventum est,  
 ‘ quando ultro ad obsequium diri facinoris accessum  
 ‘ est, labavit gressus, caligavit aspectus, tremuerunt  
 ‘ viscera, brachia conciderunt? Nonne sensus ob-  
 ‘ stupuit, lingua hæsit, sermo defecit? Stare illic  
 ‘ potuit Dei servus, et loqui et renunciare Christo,  
 ‘ qui jam diabolo renunciaverat et seculo? Nonne  
 ‘ ara illa, quo moriturus accessit, rogi illi fuit?  
 ‘ Nonne diaboli altare, quod fœtore tetro fumare ac  
 ‘ redolere conspexerat, velut funus et bustum vitæ  
 ‘ suæ, horrere ac fugere debebat? quid hostiam te-  
 ‘ cum, miser, quid victimam immolaturus imponis?  
 ‘ ipse ad aram hostia, victima ipse venisti. Immo-  
 ‘ lasti illic salutem tuam; spem tuam, fidem tuam  
 ‘ funestis illis ignibus concremasti. Ac multis pro-

CHAP. VI. ‘ prius interitus satis non fuit : hortamentis mutuis  
 150. ‘ in exitium populus impulsus est : mors invicem  
 (A.D. 250.) ‘ lethali poculo propinata est. Ac ne quid deesset  
 ‘ ad criminis cumulum, infantes quoque parentum  
 ‘ manibus vel impositi vel attracti, amiserunt parvuli  
 ‘ quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant  
 ‘ consecuti. Nonne illi, cum iudicii dies venerit,  
 ‘ dicent; nos nihil mali fecimus, nec derelicto cibo  
 ‘ et poculo Domini ad profana contagia sponte pro-  
 ‘ peravimus : perdidit nos aliena perfidia, parentes  
 ‘ sensimus parricidas. Illi nobis ecclesiam matrem,  
 ‘ illi patrem Deum negaverunt : ut dum parvi et  
 ‘ improvidi et tanti facinoris ignari per alios ad  
 ‘ consortium criminum jungimur, aliena fraude ca-  
 ‘ peremur ?’

‘ When you came to the Capitol, [the idol temple,]  
 ‘ when you went with a ready compliance to the  
 ‘ committing of that horrible crime, did not your  
 ‘ legs tremble, your sight wax dim, your bowels  
 ‘ turn, and your arms flag ? Did not your mind  
 ‘ grow amazed, your tongue falter, and your speech  
 ‘ fail you ? Could one that was God’s servant stand  
 ‘ there and speak out, and renounce Christ, who had  
 ‘ before renounced the devil and the world ? Was  
 ‘ not the altar of incense a funeral pile to him, since  
 ‘ he came thither to take his [spiritual] death ?  
 ‘ Had he not reason to abhor and fly from the altar  
 ‘ of sacrifice to the devil ; which he saw smoke and  
 ‘ stink with a nasty smell, as from the funeral fire  
 ‘ which signified the forfeiture of his life ? What  
 ‘ need hadst thou, poor wretch, to bring thy offer-  
 ‘ ing or sacrifice thither with thee ? Thou camest  
 ‘ thyself a sacrifice and a burnt-offering to the altar.  
 ‘ Thou didst there sacrifice thy salvation : thou didst



‘ burn up all thy hope and faith in those deadly  
‘ fires. CHAP. VI.

‘ There were also a great many that thought it <sup>150.</sup> (A.D. 250.)  
‘ not enough to procure their own damnation. The  
‘ multitude encouraged one another to their destruc-  
‘ tion: they drank death to one another, and pledged  
‘ each other in that poisonous cup.

‘ And that nothing might be wanting to the  
‘ measure of their wickedness, their little infants  
‘ also being led or brought in their parents’ arms,  
‘ lost that which they had obtained presently after  
‘ they were born. Will not they at the day of judg-  
‘ ment say, “ We did nothing of this, neither did we,  
‘ forsaking the meat and cup of our Lord, run of  
‘ our own accord to the partaking of those profane  
‘ defilements. It was the apostasy of others that  
‘ ruined us; we had our parents for our murderers.  
‘ It was they that renounced for us the church from  
‘ being our mother, and God from being our father.  
‘ When we, being young and inconsiderate, and not  
‘ sensible of the greatness of the crime, were made  
‘ partakers of the wickedness, we were entrapped by  
‘ the treachery of others.” ’

XII. When he says, ‘ the infants lost [or forfeit-  
‘ ed] that [gift or grace] which they had obtained  
‘ presently after they were born;’ it is plain that  
he means their baptism, or the benefits thereof.  
St. Austin had occasion to recite these words of  
St. Cyprian, and to give his comment on them. The  
occasion was this; one Boniface had put to him  
this question; ‘ whether parents do their children  
‘ that are baptized any hurt, when they carry them  
‘ to the heathen sacrifices to be cured of any illness?  
‘ and, if they thereby do them no hurt, then how it

CHAP. VI. ‘ comes to pass that the faith of the parents stands  
 150. ‘ them in stead when they are baptized; and yet  
 (A.D. 250.) ‘ their apostasy afterward should not be able to hurt  
 ‘ them?’

St. Austin<sup>b</sup> answers, that ‘ the force of that sacrament is such, that he that is once regenerated  
 ‘ by it cannot afterwards be entangled in the guilt  
 ‘ of another person’s sin, to which he does not consent.’ He gives the reason of the difference to this purpose; that the guilt of original sin descends from the parent to the child, because the child is not as yet a separate living person, *anima separatim vivens*, from his parent. But when a child is become *in se ipso alter ab eo qui genuit*, ‘ in  
 ‘ himself a separate person from him that begot  
 ‘ him,’ he is not guilty of his parent’s sin done without his consent. He derived his guilt, because he was one with him and in him from whom he derived, at the time when it was derived to him: but one does not derive from another, when each has his own proper life; so as it may be said, *the soul that sinneth it shall die*. That the faith and godly will of the parent in bringing his child to baptism is available, because the same spirit that sanctifies and regenerates the child, moves the parent to offer him to baptism. ‘ The regenerating spirit,’ says he, ‘ is  
 ‘ one and the same in the parents that bring him,  
 ‘ and in the infant that is brought and regenerated.  
 ‘ ——And the guilt is not so communicated by another person’s will, as the grace is communicated  
 ‘ by the unity [or identity] of the spirit.’

‘ Yet (as he observes afterward) the parents or  
 ‘ other guardians that endeavour thus to entangle

<sup>b</sup> Ep. 23. ad Bonifacium.

‘ their children or other infants in this sacrilege of  
 ‘ the Devil, are deservedly called spiritual murderers. CHAP. VI.  
150.  
 ‘ For they do not, it is true, effect any murder upon (A D. 250.)  
 ‘ them ; but yet as far as it lies in them they are  
 ‘ murderers : and we do with reason say to them,  
 ‘ Do not murder your infants. For the apostle says,  
 ‘ *Quench not* [or extinguish not] *the Spirit* : not  
 ‘ that he can be extinguished, but yet they are fitly  
 ‘ called extinguishers of him as much as in them  
 ‘ lies, that would have him extinguished.’

Then it is that he takes notice of this passage of St. Cyprian, and says, ‘ In this sense may that be  
 ‘ rightly understood which St. Cyprian wrote in his  
 ‘ Epistle concerning the *lapsi*, when reproving those  
 ‘ that had in the time of persecution sacrificed to  
 ‘ idols, he says, “ And that nothing might be want-  
 ‘ ing to the measure of their wickedness, their little  
 ‘ infants also being led or brought in their parents’  
 ‘ arms, lost that which they had obtained, presently  
 ‘ after they were born, &c.” They lost it, he means,  
 ‘ as far as concerns the wickedness of those by whom  
 ‘ they were brought to lose it, in the will and pur-  
 ‘ pose of those that committed so foul a wickedness  
 ‘ upon them. For if they had lost it indeed as to  
 ‘ themselves, they would have continued as persons  
 ‘ to be condemned by the sentence of God without  
 ‘ any excuse : which if St. Cyprian had thought to  
 ‘ be so, he would not presently have subjoined their  
 ‘ excuse, saying, “ Will not they at the day of judg-  
 ‘ ment say?”’ &c.

XIII. There is one place more in St. Cyprian, where he speaks of all persons in general ; yet because he names not infants particularly, I shall but just mention it. It is



CHAP. VI.      Libro iii. *Testimoniorum ad Quirinum*, c. 25.

150.  
(A.D. 250.)

This is a commonplace-book of the heads of Christian doctrine, collected by this father, and proper texts of scripture added for the proof of each of them.

The doctrine or proposition for this chapter is this :

‘Ad regnum Dei, nisi baptizatus et renatus quis fuerit, pervenire non posse.’ ‘If any one be not baptized and regenerate, he cannot come to the kingdom of God.’

The texts of scripture are, among other, these :

‘In Evangelio cata Joannem : Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu, non potest introire in regnum Dei. Quod enim natum est de carne, caro est ; et quod natum est de Spiritu, spiritus est.’ In the Gospel according to St. John : ‘Except any one be regenerate of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. For that which is born of the flesh, is flesh : and that which is born of the Spirit, is spirit.’

XIV. We have in our English language a way of speaking, whereby instead of the word *person* in a sentence, we generally use the word *man*, though the sense be such as requires to be understood of any human creature ; man, woman, or child. And so in the text of St. John here cited, John iii. 5, though the original be *ἐὰν μὴ τις*, &c. and all Latin books and writers translate it, as Cyprian here does, *Nisi quis*, &c., which signifies, *Except one* [or except any one, or except a person] *be born*, &c. Yet the English translators have rendered it, *Except a man be born*, &c. And some English antipædobaptists (learned ones you will

say) have taken the advantage of the word *man* CHAP.VI. to prove that it is of a grown person in exclusion <sup>150.</sup> of children, that our Saviour speaks. But the more (A.D.250.) wary of them, finding that this argument will from the original turn strongly against them, are willing to compound, and leave this text quite out of the dispute, and say that our Saviour does not there speak of baptism at all.

There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity in any language, but what understands it of baptism. And if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water, any more than born of wood.

I shall have occasion to speak more particularly<sup>c</sup> of the sense of the ancients concerning this text. In the mean time, we see here plainly that St. Cyprian understands it of baptism: and also we see by reading the foregoing epistle to Fidus, that he and his fellow bishops understood the case of infants particularly to be included in it.

There is another passage in St. Cyprian, from which is plainly inferred the baptism of infants, because it shews that in his church the custom was to give the communion to them at the age of four or five years. But since it mentions not their baptism expressly, I shall reserve it to the chapter<sup>d</sup> where I speak of the custom that was in some churches of their communicating.

<sup>c</sup> Part ii. ch. vi. sect. 1.    <sup>d</sup> Part ii. ch. ix. sect. 15, 16, 17.

## CHAP. VII.

*A Quotation out of the Council of Eliberis.**Concil. Eliberitanum*, [anno 305,] Can. 22.CHAP.  
VII.

§. I. ‘Si quis de catholica ecclesia ad hæresim  
transitum fecerit, rursusque [ad ecclesiam] recur-  
rerit: placuit, huic pœnitentiam non esse denegan-  
dam, eo quod cognoverit peccatum suum: qui etiam  
decem annis agat pœnitentiam; cui post decem  
annos præstari communio debet. Si vero infantes  
fuerint transducti; quod non suo vitio peccaverint,  
incunctanter recipi debent.’

‘If any one go over from the catholic church to  
any heresy [or sect] and do return again to the  
church: it is resolved that penance be not denied  
to such an one; because he acknowledges his fault.  
Let him be in a state of penance for ten years, and  
after ten years he ought to be admitted to com-  
munion. But if they were infants when they were  
carried over; inasmuch as it was not by their own  
fault that they sinned, they ought to be admitted  
presently.’

Here is indeed no express mention of these in-  
fants having been baptized in the catholic church  
before they were carried over to the sect. But in-  
asmuch as they are said to be *transducti*, ‘carried  
over’ from the catholic church; it is, I think,  
plainly implied. For the phrase of all antiquity is  
not to call any one of the church, till he be bap-  
tized. Be he infant or adult that is designed to be a  
Christian, till he be baptized they call him *catechu-  
menus*: and a catechumen is not yet of the church.



We perceive by St. Austin in many places<sup>e</sup>, that it was a common thing for the neighbours or any visitant to ask concerning a Christian's infant child, is he *fidelis* or *catechumenus*? i. e. is he yet baptized or not? So that an infant or adult person was not reckoned *fidelis* or of the church till his baptism. And therefore to speak of infants conveyed over from the catholic church to any sect, is to suppose them first baptized in the catholic church, and afterward by their parents or others carried to the congregations of the sectaries, and educated in that way. The council decrees that such upon their return to the catholic church shall be received without any penance.

Concerning the time of this council, I shall not enter into any of the nice inquiries. Almost all chronologers place it as I here do, viz. anno Dom. 305. Baluzius will have it to be ten or fifteen years later. A main exception against moving the date of it any lower is, that a great many of the canons of it do enact what penance is necessary in the several cases of such as through fear do deny the Christian religion, or comply to sacrifice to the idol gods. This is a sign that persecution reigned at that time, at least in Spain: but every body knows that a little after this time persecution for the Christian religion ceased in all the world.

II. That which will make a reader, that is not acquainted with antiquity, wonder is, that these ancient fathers do inflict so severe a penance on those that had run into any sect. They ordain that such must be kept in a state of penance (i. e. of humiliation and asking pardon of God and the church) for

<sup>e</sup> Serm. 14. de Verbis Apost. et alibi.

CHAP. VII. ten years' time before they be admitted to full communion: except they were infants when they were carried over.  
 (A.D.<sup>205</sup>.305.)

The commonness of a sin does in most men wonderfully abate the sense of the guilt of it. Nowadays if men have run into schism, and do afterwards think fit to return to the church; they are so far from being sensible of any guilt that they have incurred, that they think their very return does lay a great obligation on the church. In short, many Christians that take the word of God, not as it lies, but as their prejudices have represented, do think that adultery indeed is a sin, and drunkenness is a sin, but that schism is none.

But all the ancient Christians do express the same sentiment of the guilt of schism as St. Paul does, who<sup>f</sup> reckons those that make divisions, seditions, and heresies in the church among the most capital offenders, which *shall not inherit the kingdom of God*: such as murderers, adulterers, &c., and commands that they be excommunicated, or avoided<sup>g</sup> by all good Christians. Nor has God ever passed any act of indulgence or toleration in abatement of that law.

---

## CHAP. VIII.

*A Quotation out of the Council of Neocæsarea.*

[anno 314.]

§. I. Though this council mentions nothing at all about infants or their baptism; yet Grotius<sup>h</sup> seems to himself to have found a proof out of it that many in that age judged that they are not to be

<sup>f</sup> Gal. v. 19, 20. <sup>g</sup> Rom. xvi. 17. <sup>h</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

baptized. Bp. Taylor<sup>i</sup> from him, and from them others, prosecute the argument.

CHAP.  
VIII.

So much is plain, that some about that time and place had put this question; whether a woman with child, that had a mind to become a Christian and be baptized, might conveniently receive baptism during her going with child, or must stay till she was delivered. And it is agreed likewise that the reason of the doubt was, because when she was immersed into the water, the child in her womb did seem to some to be baptized with her: and consequently they were apt to argue that that child must not be baptized, or would not need to be baptized, afterward for itself. This any one will conclude from the words of the council, which are these:

*Concilii Neocæsariensis, canon 6.*

Περὶ κυοφορούσης, ὅτι δεῖ φωτίζεσθαι ὁπότε βούλεται. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ κοινωνεῖ ἡ τίκτουσα τῷ τικτομένῳ· διὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι.

‘ A woman with child may be baptized when she pleases. For the mother in this matter communicates nothing to the child: because in the profession every one’s own [or peculiar] resolution is declared [or because every one’s resolution at the profession is declared to be peculiar to himself.]’

II. The argument of the antipædobaptists from this passage is, that both those that raised the doubt, and the council that resolved it, must have been of opinion that it is unlawful to baptize an infant.

For, say they, those men that scrupled the baptizing of a woman with child, scrupled it for this reason, because they thought that in so doing they baptized

<sup>i</sup> Liberty of Prophesying.



CHAP. VIII. the child too; which to do had been no absurdity  
 supposing the baptism of an infant to be lawful: it  
 would have been only the doing of both under one.

<sup>214.</sup>  
 (A.D. 314.)

And also the fathers of the council, say they, do seem to grant that the baptizing of the child would be unlawful: for they give that reason why they allow the baptizing of the woman, ‘because her ‘baptism communicates nothing to the child.’

And besides, the fathers (as these men construe their words) do determine that in the baptismal profession every person must declare his own choice or resolution, which it is impossible for the infant in the womb, or any other infant to do.

III. The pædobaptists say, that this is a wide mistake of the meaning of those that raised the doubt, and of the council in resolving it. For that it was no more than this:

They that scrupled the baptizing of such a woman, scrupled it for this reason; because it would be a disputable case whether the child in her womb were to be accounted as baptized by its mother’s baptism or not: and so when that child was born, they should be in great perplexity whether they must baptize it or not. For if they did, there would be danger that it would be baptized twice: and if they did not, it was questionable whether it had any baptism at all. And that therefore it was better the woman should stay till she were delivered, and then she might be baptized for herself and the child for itself.

But the bishops in council (considering, as it is likely, the danger of the woman’s death in the meanwhile) determined otherwise; that she might be baptized if she would; and that there was no

ground for the aforesaid scruple or perplexity about the child's baptism, for that it was a plain case that the child is not to be accounted as baptized by its mother's baptism; for that such a woman's baptism reaches no further than herself, and is not communicated to the child in her womb; and give this reason; because 'the profession that any one makes 'at baptism, declares *ιδίαν προαίρεσιν*, a resolution ' [or desire to be baptized] that is peculiar to themselves:' and so the woman in this case does not desire or demand the baptism at that time for her child, but for herself only.

IV. If the reader will please to turn back and read the words once again with any attention, he will see that they are, as to the main of the determination, applicable to either of these senses. If the bishops had thought baptizing of infants unlawful, they would have determined this case much as they do, but it is no kind of proof that they did think so: because if they meant only to take away the perplexity about baptizing the child, when born, they must also determine it as they do.

But the learned reader will likewise observe that there is something in the propriety of phrase in the last clause that does incline it to this latter sense; and that is the notation of the word *ἴδιος* which properly signifies any thing 'peculiar to one's self;' and the repetition of the article *τὴν* before the words *ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ*.

If the bishops had meant to determine that the child could not be supposed to be baptized with its mother for this reason, because in baptismal profession every one must declare his own choice; and so an infant could not be baptized: they would have

CHAP.  
VIII.

(A.D. 314.)

CHAP.  
VIII.214.  
(A.D. 314.)

expressed that latter clause thus, διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον δεῖν ἑαυτοῦ τὴν προαίρεσιν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυναι, ‘because every one must make his own choice at the profession.’ But when they say, διὰ τὸ ἕκαστον ἰδίαν τὴν προαίρεσιν τὴν ἐν τῇ ὁμολογίᾳ δείκνυσθαι, they do (as any critic will observe) express this sense; ‘because the choice which is made at the [baptismal] profession, is declared by every one peculiar to himself.’ And so it is only a reason of what they had said last; ‘that the mother communicates nothing to the child:’ and not any reason against the baptizing of an infant.

V. Before I go farther, I esteem it very material to observe by the by this emphasis of the word ἴδιος, for apprehending the force of a text of St. Paul against the Polygamists. These men presume to say, that there is no prohibition in the New Testament of the plurality of wives to one man. St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 1, 2, persuades people, if they can be so content, to an absolute continence; but if they cannot, he allows marriage: but with this limitation, ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχέτω, καὶ ἕκαστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἔχέτω. The true translation of which words is, ‘Let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have a husband peculiar to her.’

For as, when Aristotle says, ἴδιον τοῦτο τοῖς ἀνθρώποις it were a very imperfect rendering to translate it, ‘men have this of their own:’ which ought to be, ‘This is proper or peculiar to men.’ And, where he says, ὁ δὲ βάτραχος ἰδίαν ἔχει τὴν γλῶσσαν to say, ‘Frogs make their own noise,’ would not reach the sense: which is, that ‘Frogs make a noise peculiar to themselves.’—So it is an imperfect translation of the foresaid words of the apostle, which our



English gives, *Let every woman have her own husband.* CHAP.  
VIII.  
The word signifies, *one peculiar to her.*

VI. But to return to our business: Grotius, among 214.  
(A.D. 314.) the arguments with which he endeavours to uphold the cause of the antipædobaptists, produces two commentators on this canon, Balsamon and Zonaras, who (as he would represent their meaning) interpret it as if the council had understood infant-baptism to be unlawful. Grotius' words are these, 'How much 'soever the commentators draw it to another sense; 'it is plain that the doubt concerning the baptizing 'women great with child, was for that reason, because the child might seem to be baptized together with its mother; and a child was not wont to be 'baptized but upon its own will and profession<sup>i</sup>.' And so Balsamon explains it, Compend. Canon. tit. 4. 'That cannot be enlightened [or baptized] 'because it is not yet come into the light, nor has 'any choice of the divine baptism.' And also Zonaras, 'The child that is now in the womb has need 'of baptism then when it shall be able to choose.'

Any one that reads this would conclude that Balsamon and Zonaras at least (if not the Neocæsarean fathers) were antipædobaptists: if he be one that does not understand that there are most full and evident records of the time in which these two men lived, (which was the twelfth century,) and that there was then no such thing as antipædobaptism in the Greek church, in which Balsamon was patriarch of Antioch.

VII. Rivet<sup>k</sup>, Marshall, &c., do accuse Grotius of

<sup>i</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>k</sup> [See 'Hugonis Grotii Annotata in Consultationem G. Casandri, cum animadversionibus Andreae Riveti:' this Treatise

CHAP.  
VIII.

<sup>214.</sup>  
(A.D. 314.)

partiality and foul dealing in general in his pleading the cause of the antipædobaptists, and particularly in this place. And though the opinion of Balsamon and Zonaras be not of that moment as to make it worth the while to repeat their words, (since they had at that distance no better opportunity of knowing the mind of the council than we now have,) yet I will set them down something at large, that the reader may see if he can acquit that great man of the crime of prevarication.

Balsamon's comment on that canon is this: 'Some had said, "that women which come over from the heathens to the church great with child ought not to be baptized, but to stay till they were delivered; least when the mother is baptized, the child in her womb do seem to be baptized too, as being altogether united to her: and so when it is born it will either be left unbaptized, or if it be baptized it may be accounted to be twice baptized." The fathers therefore, not allowing this contradiction, appointed that such women may be baptized without any scruple when they please: for that the woman has nothing common with the child in her womb in the concern of baptism: especially, say they, when as to every one in baptism his own promising is necessary. But the embryo [*ἐστέρη-  
μένον διαθέσεως*] having not the qualification [or disposition, or affection] cannot make the profession at baptism. And that clause, "when they please," was added to the canon because of some that say, "Before the embryo be formed in a human crea-

is contained in the third volume of the 'Opera Theologica' of Rivetus, published at Rotterdam in 1651-60, p. 925-976. The particular passage here alluded to by Dr. Wall occurs at p. 941.]

‘ ture, the woman may be baptized without scruple,  
 ‘ but not conveniently afterward ; because the child  
 ‘ in her womb then is in the same case as infants  
 ‘ newly born, which cannot make profession.” The  
 ‘ fathers therefore said, that it is at the woman’s  
 ‘ pleasure to be baptized when she will ; because in  
 ‘ what state the embryo is none can tell, nor be  
 ‘ sponsor for it : but infants do promise by their  
 ‘ sponsors, and being actually baptized have the  
 ‘ heavenly illumination granted to them.’

CHAP.  
 VIII.  
 214.  
 (A. D. 314.)

And in his glosses upon Photius’ Nomocanon, tit. 4. c. 10. he says, ‘ There was a question made, ‘ whether a woman with child might be baptized : ‘ for some said, “ Because the child in the womb is ‘ united to the mother as a part of her, and cannot ‘ be enlightened [or baptized] with the mother, be- ‘ cause it is not yet come into the light, nor has any ‘ choice of the profession of the divine baptism ; ‘ therefore the mother ought not to be baptized, but ‘ to stay till the child be born : lest one part of her ‘ be enlightened, and the other remain unenlight- ‘ ened. And if the child be baptized with the mo- ‘ ther’s baptism, then, if it be baptized after it is ‘ born, it will prove to be twice baptized, which is ‘ absurd.” Therefore the synod of Neocæsarea re- ‘ solve the doubt in their sixth canon,’ &c.

Zonaras’ words are these in his comment on the said canon : ‘ It determines that women with child ‘ may be baptized when they please. And whereas ‘ some affirmed, “ that the foetus is baptized together ‘ with the mother, and that therefore the infant ‘ when born must not be baptized, least it should ‘ have a double baptism :” therefore were those ‘ words added, “ for the mother in this matter com-



CHAP. VIII.  
 (A.D. 314.)<sup>214.</sup> ‘municates nothing to the child,” i. e. for the mother only and not the child is made partaker of holy baptism. Because, says he, for the profession of being joined to Christ the choice of every one is required. And by it is shewn whether he come to holy baptism with a willing mind. And because in the foetus that is enclosed in the mother’s womb there is no choice, it is not to be accounted to have received baptism; and therefore it has need of baptism again when it shall be able to choose.’

These two commentators do indeed understand the last clause of the canon in that sense which I shewed even now not to be the true sense, nor according to the rules of critics. But yet it was not fair in Grotius to represent them as being themselves, or supposing the council to be, against infant baptism: since as it appears that they suppose every one’s choice to be necessary at baptism; so it likewise appears that an infant’s choice and promise made by its sponsors or godfathers is the choice and promise they speak of. Besides that he quoting scraps of sentences, produces as Balsamon’s own words that which Balsamon had brought in as pleaded by others; and also something altered, as the reader will see by comparing.

VIII. The issue of the dispute is; the council say in this matter, what any one, whether pædobaptist or antipædobaptist, would say; and therefore the proof that they were of one or of the other opinion must be taken from some other evidence: for these words make neither for the one nor the other. And since we are now come so low as within sixty years of the time of St. Austin, Pelagius, &c., and they, as

I shall shew<sup>1</sup> presently, do declare that they never read or heard of any Christians that were against infant-baptism; it were a strange thing to suppose that there should have been a council so late as under the reign of Constantine (as this council was) and they never to have read or heard of it. No man can think but they had heard of this council, which was but a little before the time of their birth. It is plain therefore that they took the meaning of it not to have been against infant-baptism.

CHAP.  
VIII.

<sup>214.</sup>  
(A.D. 314.)

St. Austin sometimes speaks of this case of a woman baptized while great with child: and he does not only determine it as these bishops do, but he speaks of it as a clear case; perhaps because he knew it had been determined in this council. He takes occasion to mention it, lib. vi. *Contra Julianum*, c. 5, where he is shewing the weakness of that argument of the Pelagians, who said, that if original sin be the cause why infants are baptized, then the child that was born of Christian and baptized parents would not need to be baptized, as being born of those that were cleansed of that sin, and of a mother whose body was the temple of the Holy Spirit. He says among other things, this:

‘That the mother’s body should be the temple of  
‘God is the benefit of grace not of nature: which  
‘grace is conveyed not by birth, but by regenera-  
‘tion. For if that which is conceived in the mo-  
‘ther’s body did belong to it, so as to be accounted  
‘a part of it, then an infant whose mother was,  
‘upon some danger of death, baptized while she  
‘was great with him, would not need to be bap-

<sup>1</sup> Ch. xix. §. 17, and 29, 30. &c. ad 40.

CHAP. <sup>VIII.</sup> ‘tized. But now when such an infant is baptized,  
 (A.D.<sup>214.</sup><sub>314.</sub>) ‘he will not be accounted twice baptized. Therefore  
 ‘when he was in the womb of his mother, he did  
 ‘not appertain to it: and yet he was formed in a  
 ‘temple of God, but so as not to be himself the  
 ‘temple of God.’ And he has the same instance  
 over again, c. 6.

IX. Some learned men have given their conjectures of the occasion of this doubt, viz. what should make some people of this country take up an opinion, that if a woman with child were baptized, her child when born would have no need of baptism: and they give a very probable account of it<sup>1</sup>. Several Jews were dispersed in these parts: and the rabbies of the Jews had this rule concerning the baptism of proselytes; ‘If a woman great with child become a  
 ‘proselyte, and be baptized; her child needs not  
 ‘baptism when it is born:’ as I shewed in the introduction.

---

## CHAP. IX.

### *A Quotation out of Optatus Milevitanus.*

<sup>260.</sup>  
 (A.D.<sub>360.</sub>) §. I. THIS bishop living in Africa had occasion to write several books against the schism of the Donatists. Some part of the controversy between them and the catholics was about baptism: but not about infant-baptism, as a certain writer of small reading has mistaken the matter. It was whether baptism given by an ill minister were valid, or must be renewed? and whether the catholics were so corrupt a church, as that all baptized by them, whether

<sup>1</sup> Hammond’s Six Queries, Inft. Bapt. §. 109. Lightfoot’s Her. Hebr. Matt. iii.



in infancy or at age, must be baptized afresh by some such pure men as the Donatists were? CHAP. IX.

Otherwise the doctrine and practice of baptism was the same with both the parties. 260.  
(A.D. 360.)

This appears plainly by what this author says in way of persuading them to break off their schism: ‘The ecclesiastical management is one and the same with us and you. Though men’s minds are at variance, the sacraments are at none. And we may say, we believe alike, and are sealed with one and the same seal:’ no otherwise baptized than you, ‘nor otherwise ordained than you are. We read the scripture alike: we pray to the same God. The Lord’s Prayer is the same with us and you<sup>m</sup>,’ &c. The same thing is affirmed by St. Austin<sup>n</sup>. He owns their baptism, ordination, &c., to be rightly performed: he blames nothing in them but their separation. And by Cresconius the Donatist, who has these words to the catholics; ‘There is between us and you one religion, the same sacraments, nothing in the Christian ceremonies different. It is a schism that is between us, not a heresy<sup>o</sup>.’

II. But that which I mean to quote, and is all that he has occasion to say about infant-baptism, is this:

*Lib. quinto de Schismate Donatistarum, prope finem.*

[cap. 10. p. 89.]

He had been there comparing a Christian’s putting on Christ in baptism, to the putting on of a garment, and had called Christ so put on, ‘tunicam natantem in aquis,’ ‘a garment swimming in the water.’ And then says,

<sup>m</sup> Lib. iii. de Schismate Donatist. prope finem.

<sup>n</sup> Epist. ad Theodorum Donatist.

<sup>o</sup> Apud Augustinum lib. ii. contra Cresconium, c. 3.

CHAP. IX. ‘ Sed ne quis dicat, temere a me Filium Dei  
<sup>260.</sup> ‘ vestem esse dictum; legat apostolum dicentem;  
 (A.D. 360.) ‘ *Quotquot in nomine Christi baptizati estis, Christum*  
 ‘ *induistis.* O tunica semper una, et innumerabilis<sup>P</sup>,  
 ‘ quæ decenter vestiat et omnes ætates et formas:  
 ‘ nec in infantibus rugatur, nec in juvenibus tenditur,  
 ‘ nec in fæminis immutatur.’

‘ But lest any one should say, I speak irreverently,  
 ‘ in calling Christ *a garment*: let him read what the  
 ‘ apostle says, *As many of you as have been baptized*  
 ‘ *in the name of Christ, have put on Christ.* Oh what  
 ‘ *a garment* is this, that is always one and never  
 ‘ renewed, that decently fits all ages and all shapes!  
 ‘ It is neither too big for infants, nor too little for  
 ‘ men, and without any alteration fits women.’ He  
 goes on to shew how it may be also compared to the  
 wedding garment, &c. This needs no note.

---

## CHAP. X.

*A Quotation out of St. Gregory Nazianzen, concerning  
 St. Basil's Baptism in his Infancy.*

§. I. THIS quotation might have been placed  
 thirty or forty years sooner, (at which time St. Basil  
 must have been born,) because it recites a matter of  
 fact done then. But I set it at this year, because  
 this author that mentions it, began at this time to  
 be a man of note in the church, (a presbyter and  
 writer of books, &c.) though he preached the sermon  
 that I shall cite about twenty years after.

Some that have gone about to draw up a catalogue  
 of persons not baptized in infancy, though born of

<sup>P</sup> [N.B. Du Pin's edition reads ‘ immutabilis:’ but I have left  
 the text as Dr. Wall gave and translated it.]

Christian parents, have reckoned St. Basil among them: but the evidence they bring is out of spurious and forged authors, as I shall shew in its place<sup>q</sup>. And in the mean time I shall produce the authority of a piece that all acknowledge to be genuine, which, I think, shews that he was baptized in infancy.

St. Gregory Nazianzen was contemporary with St. Basil, and so well acquainted with him, as that it is impossible any one should have been more: and though he seems to have been something the older man, yet he lived to preach a sermon in commendation of him, in the nature of a funeral sermon, though it was some time after his death.

In that sermon he recites several passages of his parentage, birth, life, and death: and among them, the passage, which I take to relate to his baptism, is penned in such a rhetorical and figurative periphrasis, that taking it by itself, one is not sure whether he means baptism by it or something else. But since the first reading of it, I have observed in another discourse of his, the very same description applied plainly and purposely to baptism: which, together with the probability that it carries in itself, convinces me (and I suppose will the reader, when he compares them) that it is so to be applied in that sermon concerning St. Basil.

I shall first give the words by which he describes baptism, in his

*Oratio in Sanctum Baptisma*; Or. 40. §. 2.<sup>r</sup>

Τρίσσην γέννησιν ἡμῖν οἶδεν ὁ λόγος, τὴν ἐκ σωμαίων, τὴν ἐκ βαπτίσματος, καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀναστάσεως. Τούτων δὲ, ἡ μὲν νυκτερινή τέ ἐστι, καὶ δούλη, καὶ ἐμπαθής. Ἡ δὲ

<sup>q</sup> Part ii. ch. 3. §. 5.

<sup>r</sup> Prope ab initio.



CHAP. X. ἡμερινή, καὶ ἐλευθέρα, καὶ λυτικὴ παθῶν, πᾶν τὸ ἀπὸ  
 260. γενέσεως κάλυμμα περιτέμνουσα, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἄνω ζωὴν  
 (A.D. 360.) ἐπανάγουσα· ἡ δὲ φοβερωτέρα, καὶ συντομωτέρα, πᾶν  
 τὸ πλάσμα συνάγουσα ἐν βραχεί, τῷ πλάσῃ παρα-  
 στησόμενον.

‘ Religion teaches us that there are three sorts of  
 ‘ generation or formation : that of our bodies ; that  
 ‘ of baptism ; and that of the resurrection. The first  
 ‘ of these is of the night, and is servile, and tainted  
 ‘ with lust. The second is of the day, and is free  
 ‘ and powerful against lust, and takes away all  
 ‘ that veil [or darkness] contracted in our birth  
 ‘ [or generation], and renews us to the supernal  
 ‘ life. The last is more dreadful and sudden, bring-  
 ‘ ing together in a moment all the creation, to be  
 ‘ set before their Creator.’

And a little after, among other titles that he  
 gives to baptism, he calls it *πλάσματος ἐπανόρθωσιν*,  
 ‘ the amendment [or rectifying] of our formation.’

All that I produce this here for, is to observe the  
 phrase or description that he gives to baptism. He  
 calls our natural generation, *nocturnal*, or of the  
 night ; but the baptismal generation, *diurnal*, or of  
 the day. And Nicetas there observes, that the name  
 is taken from those words of David, Psal. cxxxix. 16,  
 where the translation of the Septuagint (which was  
 in use with them) reads (much different from our  
 English), ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον σου πάντες γραφήσονται·  
 ἡμέρας πλασθήσονται. ‘ They shall all be written in  
 ‘ thy book : they shall be formed by day.’

II. Now see what he says of St. Basil, *Funebr.*  
*Orat. in laudem Basilii* ; Orat. 20. [ed. Benedict.  
 43. §. 12.]

He had spoken of his progenitors, many of whom

were martyrs for Christ, and of the piety of his father Basil, who, it seems, was a man in holy orders: and of his mother Emmelia: and making an end of that prefatory discourse, he says,

Φέρε τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν θεωρήσωμεν. Τὰ μὲν δὴ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας ὑπὸ τῷ μεγάλῳ πατρὶ, ὃν κοινὸν παιδευτὴν ἀρετῆς ὁ Πόντος τηλικαῦτα προουβάλλετο, σπαργανούται καὶ διαπλάττεται πλάσιν τὴν ἀρίστην τὴν καὶ καθαρωτάτην, ἣν ἡμερινὴν ὁ Θεῖος Δάβιδ καλῶς ὀνομάζει, καὶ τῆς νυκτερινῆς ἀντίθετον.

‘ Now let us contemplate the affairs that relate to him himself. In the beginning then of his age he was by his excellent father, who was at that time a public teacher of virtue in the country of Pontus, swaddled, as I may call it, and formed with that best and most pure formation, which divine David rightly names “of the day,” and which is opposed to that of the night.’

Bilius in his note on these words says, ‘ he means the formation of baptism, or rather of manners: which David calls “of the day,” saying they shall be formed by day: for so it is to be read. Which excellent formation is opposite to that of the night, which is by copulation, and is sordid, and a work of darkness.’

But I believe Bilius had not animadverted (what I here observe) that it is the very same phrase which he uses in the other sermon, for baptism. I also at the first reading thought it uncertain which he meant, baptism, or good education in manners: but the likeness of a phrase so singular seems to determine it. They of that time seem to have understood that verse of the psalm; as speaking before of the Christian baptism.

CHAP. X. This formation appears to have been given in  
<sup>260.</sup> infancy, both by the words τὰ πρῶτα τῆς ἡλικίας,  
 (A.D. 360.) ‘in the beginning of his age;’ and also by the emphasis of the word σπαργανούται, which signifies the binding or first fashioning of the body of an infant in swaddling clothes; and also by the orderly method in which he proceeds: for he mentions in the next paragraph to this his childhood, in which he was educated at home, and ‘by the instructions that are ‘first in order and proper for a child, fitted for the ‘perfection he was to arrive at afterward,’ (therefore the foregoing paragraph must have referred to his infancy.) Then he proceeds to tell, that when he was a boy big enough, he was sent to school to Cæsarea, then to Byzantium, and then to the university of Athens: where it was that Gregory, who knew him before (at Cæsarea I suppose) entered, as he says, into that strict league of friendship with him which lasted during their joint lives: and in which they seemed, as he expresses it, to have ‘both but one soul informing two bodies.’ After this he relates how he went into orders, and came, in process of time, to be bishop of Cæsarea, and so famous a man as he was.

III. From this methodical enumerating all the material passages and actions of his life, arises another proof that he must have been baptized in infancy; and that the passage which I mentioned must be meant of that: because in all the passages of his life afterward he never mentions any thing of his baptism, which it had been impossible to omit if he had received it after any considerable time of his life had passed.

Also I do not see what else he can mean than



St. Basil's baptism in infancy, by another expression CHAP. X. which he has in the same oration. He is comparing 260. Basil to each of the patriarchs and holy men of the (A.D. 360.) Old Testament, Abraham, Moses, &c., and he shews how he had something in his temper, and in the passages of his life, like to something in every one of theirs. Among the rest he compares him to Samuel, and says, [§. 73.]

Σαμουήλ ἐν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ Θεῷ δοτὸς πρὸ γενέσεως, καὶ μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν εὐθὺς ἱερὸς, καὶ χρίων βασιλέας καὶ ἱερέας διὰ τοῦ κέρατος. Οὗτος δὲ, οὐκ ἐκ βρέφους Θεῷ καθιερωμένος ἀπὸ μήτρας, καὶ μετὰ τῆς διπλοῖδος ἐπιδεδομένος τῷ βήματι, καὶ βλέπων τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ Χριστὸς Κυρίου ἦν καὶ χρίστης τῶν τελειουμένων ἐκ πνεύματος ;

‘ Samuel among them that call upon his name,  
 ‘ was both given [or promised] before he was born,  
 ‘ and presently after his birth was consecrated, and  
 ‘ he became an anointer of kings and priests, out of  
 ‘ a horn. And was not this man (Basil) consecrated  
 ‘ to God in his infancy from the womb, and carried  
 ‘ to the steps [or font] in a coat? Did he not become  
 ‘ a seer of heavenly things, and an anointed of the  
 ‘ Lord, and an anointer of such as were initiated by  
 ‘ the Spirit?’

The word *βῆμα* properly signifies *steps*. It is ordinarily taken for a *pulpit*, to which one goes up by steps: and it may signify a *font* or *baptistery*, to which they did go down by steps. But the coat in which he says Basil was offered to God, (alluding to the child's coat which was made for Samuel by his mother,) cannot well be supposed to have been any thing but the albs used at baptism. And this, he says, was in his infancy.

CHAP. X. The instance of Samuel dedicated in infancy, is  
 260.  
 (A.D. 360.) one which this father does at other places make use  
 of for a comparison or example of a Christian's child  
 baptized in infancy: as will be seen in the next  
 chapter; where speaking to some tender mothers  
 that were afraid, it seems, of putting their infants  
 into the water at baptism, he says, 'Thou art afraid  
 'as a faint-hearted mother,' &c. 'But Hannah,  
 'before Samuel was born, devoted him to God: and  
 'when he was born, presently consecrated him, and  
 'brought him up in a priestly coat.' The very thing  
 that he says here of St. Basil's parents.

---

CHAP. XI.

*Other Quotations out of St. Gregory Nazianzen, concerning  
 the Doctrine of Infant-Baptism.*

§. I. THIS father was not himself baptized in  
 infancy: and if it be true that he was born after  
 the time that his father was a Christian and in  
 holy orders, (of which the antipædobaptists do give  
 probable evidence,) he had the most reason of any  
 one in those times to be prejudiced against the  
 doctrine of the necessity of infant-baptism; which  
 he could not urge himself, nor hear urged by others,  
 without some reproach thereby cast on the conduct  
 of his father, for whom he always expressed a great  
 reverence; though other writers give him but a  
 mean character, and shew that the son's prudence<sup>s</sup>  
 and skill was found necessary to retrieve the father's  
 credit and the esteem of the people, and to preserve  
 him from being overwitted by the Arians, or frightened  
 by their power.

<sup>s</sup> Greg. Presbyter. in Vita Naz.

So much is certain, that of all the instances CHAP. XI.  
brought by the antipædobaptists of men who being 260.  
baptized Christians themselves, yet did not baptize (A.D. 360.)  
their children in infancy, there is a better appearance  
of proof in this man's father's case than in any other.  
Of which instances I must treat more largely in a  
chapter<sup>t</sup> on purpose; and at present give account of  
what this author himself speaks of the doctrine of  
infant-baptism.

II. All that I have to produce is taken out of his  
sermon that I mentioned before; viz. his

*Oratio de Baptismo*, Or. 40.

In which he both persuades those of his hearers,  
who had not yet so thoroughly embraced Christianity  
as to be baptized into it, that they would without  
delay be partakers of it, and also speaks something  
concerning the necessity of it to infants.

Of this oration I will give a short abstract, setting  
down the original of such passages only, as do, some  
way, affect the question in hand.

After some commendations of baptism, he pro-  
ceeds [§. 4.] to mention the names or titles by which  
it is called, which are these; ‘The gift, the grace,  
‘baptism or washing, the anointing, the laver of  
‘regeneration, the amending of our make,’ or forma-  
tion, ‘the seal:’ and explains the reason of these  
several appellations.

Then having spoken of man's natural and original  
corruption, he says, ‘God has not left his creature  
‘without a remedy; but as he first made us, so he  
‘renews us by this divine formation:’ ἡ τοῖς μὲν ἀρ-  
χομένοις ἐστὶ σφραγὶς, τοῖς δὲ τελειότεροις τὴν ἡλικίαν  
καὶ χάρισμα, καὶ τῆς πεσούσης εἰκόνος διὰ τὴν κακίαν

<sup>t</sup> Part<sup>ii</sup>. ch. 3.



CHAP. XI. ἐπ'ανόρθωσις. 'which as it is a seal for such persons as  
 260. 'newly enter into life; so to those that are adult it  
 (A.D. 360.) 'is a grace, and the restoring of the image which  
 'they had lost.' [§. 7.]

Then he says, the force and effect of baptism is,  
 'A covenant with God of a new and holy life:' and  
 argues from thence how careful we ought to be to  
 keep it entire, 'and that,' says he, οὐκ οὔσης δευτέρας  
 ἀναγεννήσεως, 'because there is no regeneration to be  
 'had afterward,' Yet he grants there is repentance  
 afterward: but that leaves a scar, and requires a  
 long time, and many tears; which we know not  
 whether God will give us a space for. (They, as I  
 observed before, gave the name of regeneration to  
 no other but the baptismal renewing.) [§. 8.]

Then he warns them of the tentations that they  
 must expect after their baptism, and how they must  
 oppose and overcome them. [§. 10.]

III. Against the delay of baptism, he minds them  
 of the danger of missing it by sudden death: and  
 how much more creditable and comfortable it is to  
 receive it voluntarily in the time of health and  
 strength, than in time of necessity on a sickbed,  
 'when the tongue falters, and can hardly utter the  
 'words of the holy initiation; and the washing is  
 'more like the washing of a corpse than religious  
 'baptism.' That a generous mind will desire not  
 only the forgiveness of sins, but also the reward  
 promised to virtuous actions, for which there must  
 some time be allowed between baptism and death.  
 [§. 11, 12.]

That there are three sorts of persons very different,  
 though all of them may be saved; 'the slave,  
 'the mercenary, and the son.' The first minds no

more than the escaping of punishment : the second CHAP. XI.  
 regards nothing but the pay : the son's mind is full 260.  
 of duty and love to his father. That all other good (A.D. 360.)  
 things we desire to enjoy as soon as may be : and  
 so we ought to do this freedom from sin. [§. 13.]

That the Devil would indeed entice us to give  
 him the present, and God the remainder ; him the  
 flower of our age, and God the dregs. But that  
 we must consider the many hazards we are subject  
 to : ‘ the chance of war, an earthquake, the sea, a  
 ‘ wild beast, a disease, a crumb of bread, a surfeit,  
 ‘ a precipice, a horse, a medicine, a tyrant,’ &c.  
 [§. 14.]

Then he answers the pretences which the half  
 Christians of those times made for their delay. As,  
 ‘ I am afraid I shall not keep the grace of baptism  
 ‘ unstained, and so will not take my cleansing yet,  
 ‘ as having none to take afterward.—Oh crafty  
 ‘ imposture,’ says he, ‘ of the evil spirit ! He is in-  
 ‘ deed darkness, yet he counterfeits light. When  
 ‘ he does not prevail by open war, he lays his snares.  
 ‘ When he cannot bring thee to despise baptism, he  
 ‘ would cheat thee of it by overmuch caution,’ &c.  
 ‘ He sets on all ages, and must be resisted in all.’  
 [§. 16.] ‘ Art thou a youth ? fight against pleasures  
 ‘ and passions with this auxiliary strength : list thy-  
 ‘ self in God's army,’ &c.—‘ Art thou old ? let thy  
 ‘ grey hairs hasten thee : strengthen thy old age  
 ‘ with baptism,’ &c.—*Νήπιόν ἐστί σοι ; μὴ λαβέτω*  
*καιρὸν ἡ κακία ἐκ βρέφους ἀγιασθήτω, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιε-*  
*ρωθήτω πῶ Πνεύματι. Σὺ δέδοικας τὴν σφραγίδα διὰ τὸ*  
*τῆς φύσεως ἀσθενές ; ὡς μικρόψυχος ἢ μήτηρ καὶ ὀλιγό-*  
*πιστος. ἡ Ἄννα δὲ, καὶ πρὶν ἢ γεννηθῆναι τὸν Σαμουὴλ,*  
*καθυπέσχετο τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ γεννηθέντα ἱερὸν εὐθὺς ποιεῖ,*

CHAP. XI. καὶ τῇ ἱερατικῇ στολῇ συνανέθρεψεν, οὐ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον  
<sup>260.</sup> φοβηθείσα, τῷ δὲ Θεῷ πιστεύσασα. [§. 17.]

(A.D. 360.)

‘Hast thou an infant-child? let not wickedness  
 ‘have the advantage of time: let him be sanctified  
 ‘from his infancy: let him be dedicated from his  
 ‘cradle to [or by] the spirit. Thou, as a faint-  
 ‘hearted mother and of little faith, art afraid of  
 ‘giving him the seal because of the weakness of  
 ‘nature. Hannah, before Samuel was born, devoted  
 ‘him to God, and as soon as he was born, consecrated  
 ‘him, and brought him up from the first in a  
 ‘priestly garment, not fearing for human infirmities,  
 ‘but trusting in God. Thou hast no need of amulets  
 or charms; together with which the Devil slides  
 ‘into the minds of shallow persons, drawing to him-  
 ‘self the veneration that is due to God. Δὸς αὐτῷ  
 ‘τὴν τριάδα, τὸ μέγα καὶ καλὸν φυλακτήριον. Give to him  
 ‘the Trinity, that great and excellent preservative.’

He proceeds to stir up all persons in all estates and employments to receive baptism: only he would advise those that had places in court, to resign, and fly from Sodom, if conveniently they could, when they were baptized: (it is to be noted that Valens, a wicked and Arian emperor, reigned at that time.) If they could not conveniently, yet to be baptized; and preserve the purity thereof as well as they could in so ill a station: that God in judging of our lives makes allowance for the circumstances that we are in: ‘that for a man that is fettered to  
 ‘get forward a little, is as great praise as for an-  
 ‘other to run: for one that travels in a dirty road  
 ‘to be but a little bespattered, is more remarkable  
 ‘than for another to be clean.’ [§. 19.]

V. He next sets upon those men that put off their



baptism to death or old age, for the love of their  
 sinful pleasures which they were unwilling as yet  
 to part with: who said, ‘Where is the advantage  
 ‘ of taking baptism so soon, and thereby cutting  
 ‘ one’s self off from all the worldly pleasures and  
 ‘ delights? Whereas one may enjoy these pleasures  
 ‘ in the mean while, and then be baptized at last.  
 ‘ For they that went the earliest to labour in the  
 ‘ vineyard sped no better than they that came in  
 ‘ the latest.’

260.  
 A.D. 360.)

He answers; ‘You have saved me a great deal of  
 ‘ trouble by your making this plea: for you have at  
 ‘ last with much ado discovered the very secret of  
 ‘ this delay. And though I dislike your wicked  
 ‘ purpose; yet I commend you for one thing, that  
 ‘ you own it without disguise.

‘Come on then, and give the sense of this parable:  
 ‘ and be not ignorantly scandalized [or drawn into  
 ‘ sin] by this place of scripture.

‘First, this is not meant of baptism, but of those  
 ‘ who come, some sooner, some later, to the faith,  
 ‘ [or the knowledge of Christian religion,] and enter  
 ‘ the vineyard, the church: for every one must labour  
 ‘ from that day and hour on which he comes to the  
 ‘ faith,’ &c.

‘Besides, supposing by entering the vineyard  
 ‘ baptism be meant, the parable shews that those  
 ‘ that do at all enter the vineyard and labour, shall  
 ‘ have a reward. But you are in danger to miss of  
 ‘ doing that. If you were sure that notwithstanding  
 ‘ this wicked contrivance to avoid labouring, you  
 ‘ should at last obtain baptism; you might be par-  
 ‘ doned in this sordid cunning: but since there is  
 ‘ danger, that while you take this advantage, you

CHAP. XI. 'will quite miss of the vineyard, &c., take my  
 260.  
 (A.D. 360.) 'counsel, lay aside these subtleties, and come with  
 'an honest mind to baptism; lest you be taken out  
 'of this life before you attain your purpose, and be  
 'found to have devised these fallacies to your own  
 'destruction.' [§. 20, 21.]

But you will say, 'Is not God merciful enough  
 'to take in such a case the desire of baptism for  
 'baptism?'

VI. 'You would have us believe a monstrous  
 'thing, if you think that God, because he is merci-  
 'ful, will count him enlightened that is not; and  
 'take him into the kingdom of heaven that wishes  
 'for it, but does not perform the things that make  
 'the way to it. I will tell you what is my opinion  
 'of this matter; in which, I believe, considering  
 'men will agree with me.' [§. 22.]

'As there are several sorts of those who do ob-  
 'tain the gift of baptism: Some were before ex-  
 'tremely wicked,' &c. 'Others,' &c.———'So it  
 'is likewise in those who miss of baptism. For  
 'some of them live like beasts and regard not bap-  
 'tism,' &c. 'Some have a value for baptism, but  
 'delay the receiving of it, either out of negligence,  
 'or δι' ἀπληστίαν out of greediness longer to enjoy  
 'their lusts: Οἱ δὲ οὐδὲ εἰσὶν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δεξασθαι, ἢ  
 'διὰ νηπιότητα τυχόν, ἢ τινα τελέως ἀκούσιον περιπέτειαν,  
 'ἐξ ἧς οὐδὲ βουλομένοις αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχει τυχεῖν τοῦ χα-  
 'ρίσματος. But some others have it not in their own  
 'power to receive it, either because of their infancy  
 'perhaps, or by reason of some accident utterly in-  
 'voluntary; so that though they desire it, they have  
 'no opportunity to obtain the gift. As therefore we  
 'found much difference among those [that do obtain

‘ baptism], so there is among these [that miss CHAP.XI.  
‘ of it.]

‘ They that wholly scorn it, are worse than the <sup>260.</sup> (A.D.360.)  
‘ negligent or those that crave longer time. But  
‘ these are worse than those who fail of the gift,  
‘ ἐξ ἀγνοίας καὶ τυραννίδος, by ignorance or constraint :  
‘ τυραννὶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄλλό τι ἢ ἀκούσιος διαμαρτία, for con-  
‘ straint is no other thing than to miss against one’s  
‘ will.

‘ And I think of the first sort, that they shall be  
‘ punished, as for their other wickedness, so for  
‘ their slighting of baptism. And that the second  
‘ shall be punished, but in a less degree, because  
‘ they are guilty of their own missing it, but rather  
‘ through folly than malice. Τοὺς δὲ μητὲρ δοξασθήσεσ-  
‘ θαι μητὲρ κολασθήσεσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δικαίου κριτοῦ, ὡς  
‘ ἀσφραγίστους μὲν, ἀπονήρους δὲ, ἀλλὰ παθόντας μᾶλλον  
‘ τὴν ζημίαν ἢ δρασάντας : but that the last sort will  
‘ neither be glorified nor punished by the just Judge ;  
‘ as being without the seal, but not through their own  
‘ wickedness ; and as having suffered the loss rather  
‘ than occasioned it.

‘ For he that is not worthy of punishment, is not  
‘ therefore presently worthy of honour ; as he that  
‘ is not worthy of honour, does not therefore de-  
‘ serve punishment.

‘ And I think thus also ; If you would condemn  
‘ for murder a man that has not murdered, merely  
‘ because he had a mind so to do ; then let him go  
‘ with you for a baptized person, who had a mind to  
‘ it, but had it not. But if that be absurd, I do not  
‘ see how this can be reasonable.

‘ Or if you please, take it thus : If to obtain the  
‘ effect of baptism you think it sufficient that you



CHAP. XI. 'desired baptism, and thereupon claim the glory of  
 260. 'heaven; let the desire of that glory suffice you in-  
 (A.D. 360.) 'stead of the glory itself: for what matter is it if  
 'you go without it, so long as you have the desire  
 'of it.' [§. 23.]

He next blames those that pretended they would stay till Epiphany or Easter or Whitsuntide, and then be baptized. 'What will come of this?' says he, 'the end of your life will come on a sudden, in a  
 'day and hour that you think not of,' &c. [§. 24.]

Those that would stay for the presence of their friends and relations, or till they had got ready an offering for the church, or a present for the baptizer, or a handsome white garment, or provision for a treat, he chides in these words; 'These things I  
 'warrant you are mighty necessary, and the grace  
 'of baptism will be never the less for want of these.  
 'In things of great consequence do not stand upon  
 'trifling matters. This sacrament is of higher con-  
 'cern,' &c. 'For an offering, give yourself. Put  
 'on Christ. Treat me with your commendable life.  
 'God values nothing but those things which the  
 'poor have to give as well as the rich,' &c. [§. 25.]

It is in like manner that he reproves such as stood on height and punctilios, that would have a bishop, or a metropolitan, or the bishop of Jerusalem, or (if it were a priest) one that led an unmarried life, for their baptizer: or that scorned to be baptized together with a poor man, or counted the length of the service too tedious.

He tells them the most acceptable posture or preparation to receive it, is a heart inflamed with the desire of it; that God takes that for a kindness, if we be earnestly desirous of his kindnesses: he

takes more pleasure in giving than others in receiving, &c. [§. 26, 27.]

VII. He concludes that paragraph with saying, 'We must therefore make it our utmost care that we do not miss of the common grace:' and then follow these words, Ἐστω ταῦτα, φησὶ, περὶ τῶν ἐπιζητούντων τὸ βάπτισμα· τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων, καὶ μήτε τῆς ζημίας ἐπαισθανομένων, μήτε τῆς χάριτος; ἢ καὶ ταῦτα βαπτίσομεν; πάννυγε, εἴπέρ τις ἐπείγοι κίνδυνος. Κρεῖσσον γὰρ ἀναισθήτως ἀγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα· καὶ τούτου λόγος ἡμῖν ἡ ὀκταήμερος περιτομή, τυπικὴ τις οὖσα σφραγίς, καὶ ἀλογίστοις ἔτι προσαγομένη· ὥς δὲ καὶ ἡ τῶν φλιῶν χρίσις, διὰ τῶν ἀναισθήτων φυλάττουσα τὰ πρωτότοκα. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων δίδωμι γνώμην, τὴν τριετίαν ἀναμείναντας, ἢ μικρὸν ἐντὸς τούτου, ἢ ὑπὲρ τοῦτο, ἡνίκα καὶ ἀκοῦσαι τι μυστικὸν καὶ ἀποκρίνεσθαι δύνατον, εἰ καὶ μὴ συνιέντα τελέως ἄλλ' οὖν τυπούμενα, οὕτως ἀγιάζειν καὶ ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τῆς τελειώσεως. 'Some may say, suppose this to hold in the case of those that can desire baptism: What say you to those that are as yet infants, and are not in capacity to be sensible either of the grace or the miss of it? Shall we baptize them too? Yes, by all means, if any danger make it requisite. For it is better that they be sanctified without their own sense of it, than that they should die *unsealed* and *uninitiated*. And a ground of this to us is *circumcision*, which was given on the eighth day, and was a typical seal [or baptism] and was practised on those that had no use of reason: as also the anointing of the doorposts, which preserved the first-born by things that have no sense. As for others, I give my opinion that they should stay three years or thereabouts,

CHAP. XI. ‘ when they are capable to hear and answer some of  
 260. ‘ the holy words: and though they do not perfectly  
 (A.D. 360.) ‘ understand them, yet they form them: and that  
 ‘ you then sanctify them in soul and body with the  
 ‘ great sacrament of initiation. For though they are  
 ‘ not liable to give account of their life before  
 ‘ their reason be come to maturity, (they having this  
 ‘ advantage by their age, that they are not forced  
 ‘ to account for the faults they have committed in  
 ‘ ignorance,)’ *τετειχίσθαι δὲ τῷ λουτρῷ παντὶ λόγῳ*  
*λυσιτελέστερον, διὰ τὰς ἐξαίφνης συμπιπτούσας ἡμῖν*  
*προσβολὰς τῶν κινδύνων, καὶ βοηθείας ἰσχυροτέρας,* ‘ yet by  
 ‘ reason of those sudden and unexpected assaults of  
 ‘ dangers that are by no endeavour to be prevented,  
 ‘ it is by all means advisable that they be secured  
 ‘ by the laver [of baptism].’ [§. 28.]

Then he answers the objection or pretence which some made from our Saviour’s being thirty years old before he was baptized; shewing the disparity in a great many particulars: one is this, that there was no danger in his delaying, who needed no purgation; and besides had the time of his death as well as of his birth at his own disposal. ‘But to you,’ says he, ‘there is a great deal of danger, if you ‘should depart this life, having been begotten in ‘corruption, and not being clothed with incorruption ‘and immortality.’ [§. 29.]

VIII. The rest of the sermon is spent, partly in teaching them how to prepare themselves, viz. by fasting, watching, prayer, almsdeeds, restitution of goods illgotten in the time of their heathenism, (for, he says, though in baptism they are pardoned all past sins, yet he that keeps in his hands, after baptism, any thing that is in justice due to another, continues in the sin; to keep it is a present sin,



though the act of stealing it be a past one,) and partly, in charging on their consciences the necessity of keeping their baptismal vow, when they have made it: in shewing the wretched estate from which they are delivered, the happy one into which they are going to be entered, and the dreadful one into which they will fall if they revolt: [§. 30—40.] and partly, in explaining the creed and faith into which they are baptized; where he especially insists on the belief of the holy Trinity (for these were times in which the Arian heresy was rife): of which having spoken largely, and answered the charge of tritheism cast on the catholics, and other objections of the Arians, he declares he will baptize none of them that do not own this faith. ‘And if you do still halt,’ says he, ‘and do not own the divinity full and perfect; seek for somebody else to baptize [or dip] you, or rather drown [or destroy] you: for I have no mind to divide the Deity, and at the time of your new birth to bring death on you: so that you will have neither baptism, nor the hope of the grace, your salvation being quickly shipwrecked. For if you deny divinity to any of these three, you overthrow the whole [Trinity], and make your baptism of no force [or benefit] to you.’ [§. 41—44.]

He concludes with giving the meaning of some ceremonies then used at baptism: particularly of the lamps they lighted and held in their hands, denoting those of the wise virgins that were prepared to meet their Lord: of which parable he makes a goodly application to them. [§. 46.]

IX. Among the things that we are to observe from this oration, this ought to be one:

## CHAP. XI.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

1. The strange mistake that Grotius made when he went<sup>u</sup> about to disprove the ancient practice of infant baptism from this very sermon, in which there is nothing more or otherwise said of that matter than I have recited. He takes a few words out of this discourse, and even out of one of the passages here<sup>x</sup> recited, where Gregory speaks of some, οἱ οὐδὲ εἶσιν ἐν δυνάμει τοῦ δέξασθαι, διὰ νηπιότητα τυχόν, ἢ τινα τελέως ἀκούσιον περιπέτειαν, ‘who have  
‘not the receiving of baptism in their own power,  
‘either for their infancy perhaps, or by reason of  
‘some accident utterly involuntary,’ of whom it is said a little after, that they lose the kingdom of heaven by so dying unbaptized, but yet escape punishment, because it was not their fault. He takes out of these words, the words διὰ νηπιότητα by themselves, and makes this use of them; that Gregory mentioning some ‘that are not baptized’ διὰ νηπιότητα ‘by reason of their infancy,’ imports that infants were not wont to be baptized. Whereas it imports only, that an infant, if he have nobody to help him to it, is incapable of having baptism.

X. 2. It appears most evidently by the tenor of this sermon, that Nazianzen held concerning baptism these tenets:

1. That all who died unbaptized, by their own fault or negligence, were condemned.

2. He thought that infants dying unbaptized, and adult persons who missed of baptism by some unavoidable impediment, and not by their own fault, were in a kind of middle state between happiness and torment. But that baptized infants were partakers of the kingdom of heaven.

<sup>u</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>x</sup> Supra, §. 6.

3. Where there is no danger of an infant's death, CHAP. XI.  
 he has a particular opinion (which he accordingly 260.  
 expresses<sup>y</sup>) thus, *δίδωμι γνώμην*, (I give my opinion,) (A D. 360.)  
 that his baptism should be delayed till he is three  
 years old: which would please neither the pædo-  
 baptist nor antipædobaptist.

He seems to have taken up this opinion in some degree of compliance with his father's practice, who probably had kept him unbaptized so long purposely, and then seeing no danger of death, delayed it farther from time to time.

This man and Tertullian are the only two that speak of delaying it at all: one, till the age of reason; the other, till three years. Both one and the other are to be understood, where there is no danger of death in the mean while: which is plainly expressed<sup>z</sup> here, and in Tertullian is collected from his other speeches.

XI. 3. He uses three or four times in this oration (as he does also frequently in his other works) the word *ἀγιασθῆναι* 'to be sanctified,' [or made holy,] for baptism. And so did St. Cyprian in his words before cited<sup>a</sup>, and other places: and so do the ancients generally. Mr. Walker<sup>b</sup> has taken the pains to produce quotations out of almost all the ancient writers to shew that this was a common phrase with them, to say, an infant or other person *sanctified*, when they mean baptized: and I do, for brevity's sake, refer the reader to his book. The scripture also uses it so, 1 Cor. vi. 11. Eph. v. 26.

Which makes that explication of 1 Cor. vii. 14. 'Now are your children holy,' which is given by

<sup>y</sup> Supra, §. 7.

<sup>z</sup> §. 7.

<sup>a</sup> Ch. vi. §. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Modest

Plea for Infant Baptism, ch. 29.



CHAP. XI. Tertullian, St. Austin, St. Hierome, Paulinus, Pelagius<sup>c</sup>, and other ancients; and since by Dr. Hammond<sup>d</sup>, Mr. Walker<sup>e</sup>, &c. much the more probable, whereby they make the words *ἁγία* ‘holy,’ and *ἡγιάσται* ‘has been sanctified,’ to refer to baptism.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

And their explication is also the more probable, because there has no other sense of those words been yet given by expositors but what is liable to much contest: but especially that sense, which some antipædobaptists have endeavoured to affix to them, (of legitimacy in opposition to bastardy) seems the most forced and far-fetched of all. The words are, *ἡγιάσται γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγιάσται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀνδρί· ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ ἁγία ἐστιν.* The grammatical translation of which words is, ‘for the unbelieving husband [or an unbelieving husband] has been sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife [or an unbelieving wife] has been sanctified by the husband. Else your children would be unclean: but now they are holy [or saints].’ Our translators altered the tense and put it ‘is sanctified’ instead of ‘has been sanctified,’ because they thought, it seems, the sense required it: but without any such alteration, the paraphrase given by many learned men is to this purpose:

For it has ordinarily come to pass, that an unbelieving husband has been brought to the faith and so to baptism, by his wife: and likewise an unbelieving wife by her husband. If it were not so; and if the wickedness or infidelity of the unbelieving party did usually prevail, the children of such would be generally kept unbaptized, and so be unclean. But

<sup>c</sup> See ch. xix. §. 19.

<sup>d</sup> Six Queries.

<sup>e</sup> Modest Plea.

now we see, by the grace of God, a contrary effect, CHAP. XI.  
 for they are generally baptized, and so become holy, 260.  
 or sanctified. (A.D. 360.)

If the reader will turn back to ch. 4. §. 12. and also compare the quotations I shall produce in ch. 15. §. 2. and ch. 18. §. 4. and ch. 19. §. 19. of this book, he will see that St. Austin's and Pelagius' comment on those words of the apostle is exactly to this purpose: and that Tertullian differs from them only in this, that he expounds the holiness that such children have by the prerogative of their birth, by these words, *sanctitati designati*, 'designed for holiness,' because he reckons and proves from scripture, that they cannot be actually holy till they are actually baptized: and that St. Hierome and Paulinus speak to the same effect.

The word *ἅγιοι* in the New Testament is translated sometimes *saints*, sometimes *holy* persons; and was in the same use with them as the word *Christians* is with us.

There are two things, beside what I have mentioned, that do make this sense the more natural to that place. One is, that it appears by the apostle's other words in the context, that this was his scope of arguing. *For what knowest thou, O wife*, says he, *whether thou shalt save thy husband?* i. e. by bringing him over to the faith: *Or how knowest thou, O man, whether thou shalt save thy wife?* This is a very different aim from what he would have, if he meant only that an unbelieving wife is sanctified to a believer for the use of the bed, as unclean meats are to a faithful eater.

Another is, that the custom of the Jewish language had made it ordinary before the apostles' time

CHAP. XI. to use the word *to sanctify* for baptizing or washing.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.) Where God commands Moses at the giving of the law, Exod. xix. 10, *Sanctify them to-day and to-morrow*; all the learned Jews understand it, that he bid him baptize, i. e. wash them. And they prove from this place that Israel entered into covenant by baptism as well as circumcision. Most of the orders to the priests and Levites to sanctify themselves, are explained by washing themselves. Where it is said, Lev. vi. 27, *Whatsoever shall touch the flesh of the sin offering shall be holy*, the original word is, *shall be sanctified*: that is, (as the following verses shew,) shall be washed. In 2 Sam. xi. 4. it is said, *Bathsheba was purified* (in the original *was sanctified*) *from her uncleanness*: and this was done by washing. The *divers washings* among the Jews, mentioned Heb. ix. 10, (where it is in the original, *divers baptisms*,) are frequently styled by the Jews in their writings, *sanctifications*: as the priest's washing his hands and feet ten times on the day of atonement, is called by them *the ten sanctifications*. This is so fully cleared by Ainsworth, Lightfoot, Hammond, &c., that there need no more be said of it.

St. Austin in his Questions on Leviticus has this inquiry; how it is meant that Moses should *sanctify the high priest*, Lev. xxi. 8, when God says, ver. 15, *I the Lord do sanctify him*<sup>f</sup>? In answer to which he distinguishes between the visible sanctification and the invisible: and after some discourse that the invisible is the chief, but yet that the other is not to be neglected, says, ‘Hence Cornelius, and they that were with him, when they appeared to

<sup>f</sup> Quæst. 84.



‘ be already sanctified invisibly by the Holy Ghost CHAP. XI.  
 ‘ coming on them, were for all that baptized : nor 260.  
 ‘ was the visible sanctification counted needless be- (A.D. 360.)  
 ‘ cause the invisible was before.’

St. Paul inscribes his Epistles sent to the Christians of any place, thus, *τοῖς ἁγίοις* ‘ to the holy persons ;’ or thus, *τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις* ‘ to such as have been sanctified’ at such or such a place. And so the inscription of his letter to the Corinthian Christians in these words, *Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, κλητοῖς ἁγίοις* : to them that are sanctified [or have been sanctified] in Christ Jesus, called to be saints<sup>g</sup> : it is but a larger periphrasis of what one would have said ; to all that are Christians there. And St. Chrysostom<sup>h</sup> in his comment on these very words puts the question, *τὶ δέ ἐστιν ὁ ἡγιασμός* ; ‘ What is the sanctification he speaks of?’ and answers readily, *τὸ λουτρὸν, ὁ καθαρισμὸς*, ‘ the laver,’ their baptism, ‘ their cleansing.’

The ancient church likewise that compiled the Apostles’ Creed, when they would declare it as an article of Christian religion, that all Christians ought to hold communion with one another, express that article thus, ‘ The communion’ *τῶν ἁγίων* ‘ of saints.’

Therefore when St. Paul in this place uses the very same word, and says, *else your children would be unclean ; but now they are ἁγία*, (which word is rendered in English sometimes *saints*, sometimes *holy*,) it is not at all alien to his ordinary use of the word to understand it, else your children

<sup>g</sup> 1 Cor. i. 2.

<sup>h</sup> [Homil. i. in Epist. i. ad Corinthios, §. 1. Tom. x. edit. Montfaucon.]

CHAP. XI. would be kept unbaptized, unsanctified, unchristian, unholy, or unclean: but now they are generally sanctified by baptism, and become holy or Christians. If we had lived in the times of the ancients, when the word *sanctified* was used in common speech for baptized, this would have seemed a natural interpretation.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

This exposition, as it avoids on one side the inconveniency of that given by the antipædobaptists, which takes the word *holy* and *unclean* in a sense in which they are never used in scripture: so it is likewise free from the exceptions which lie against that which limits the baptism of children so absolutely to that condition of their being born of believing parents; that it leads the baptizer into many perplexing scruples, whose children he may baptize, and whose not. As the late bishop of Worcester<sup>i</sup> has largely shewn.

4. What St. Gregory here says in the last place, that he will baptize no Arian, nor any that disown the Godhead of Christ, and the Trinity, is according to the general sense of the catholics of that, and of the foregoing times. They would not hold communion with the Arians, and consequently would not by baptism enter such as members into their church. The greatest persecutions that the catholics at any time suffered, were on this account. For the Arian emperors seldom went so far as to force the bishops to renounce the catholic faith and turn Arians: but they would banish them, unless they would receive the Arians to communion, or join with them. It was upon this account that Atha-

<sup>i</sup> Bishop Stillingfleet, in his *Unreasonableness of Separation*, part iii. §. 36.

nasius (who flourished from the beginning to almost the end of the Arian controversy) did so often suffer exile; because he would not admit Arius or his followers to communion, when it was desired by Constantine (who sought herein the quietness of his own government) and the other emperors that were themselves Arians. CHAP. XI.  
260.  
(A.D. 360.)

These ancients reckoned that Christians might and ought to hold communion notwithstanding difference of opinions in lesser matters: but that this was a fundamental one, as relating to that which is the direct object of our worship.

The Arians for this reason made a great many attempts to express their faith in such ambiguous terms as might seem to agree with the catholic sense. It is a wonder to see in Socrates<sup>k</sup> and other church historians, how many creeds were set forth for this purpose as schemes of agreement between the two parties. Some of these served in some churches to patch up for a while an unsound union; which was broken to pieces again as soon as each party expressed their meaning in other words. And it was found at last by a long trial that there was no firm agreement to be had but by owning the terms of the Nicene Creed. Mr. le Clerc observes somewhere, that the major part of the councils in those times, and of the creeds drawn up in them, were on the Arian side. Nobody need envy them this advantage: for we are not for a number of creeds. The catholics adhered to the Nicene, and were for having no more than that: it was the Arian party, which not agreeing among themselves, multiplied several draughts of faith. The Nicene

<sup>k</sup> Hist. lib. ii.



CHAP. XI. Creed was at last found to be the only test to distinguish a catholic from an Arian.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

XII. This I observe on account of some modern Arians, or rather they are to be called Photinians; for they have much more dishonourable opinions of our Saviour Christ than the Arians had, and are more in the sentiments of Photinus, who was in the Arian times condemned<sup>1</sup> both by the catholics and the Arians.

There are of them both among the pædobaptists and the antipædobaptists: whether the antipædobaptists, that believe in the Trinity, do baptize and receive into communion any such, or not, I am not sure. It is not likely that they who do separate from one another for far lesser differences, will dispense with so great an one about the divinity of Christ.

But those antitrinitarians, that are pædobaptists, in England, have of late, on a sudden, declared themselves to be at unity with the catholic church: yet the account which they give of their conversion to a good opinion of the catholic faith, is the oddest one that was ever given in so serious a matter. One does not know whether they are in earnest, or whether they mock in speaking of that awful mystery. About the year 1697 they published a paper<sup>m</sup> which they called ‘The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church:’ drawn up by themselves,

<sup>1</sup> Socrat. lib. ii. cap. 29.

<sup>m</sup> [The Agreement of the Unitarians with the Catholic Church. Being also a full Answer to the Infamations of Mr. Edwards; and the needless Exceptions of my Lords the Bishops of Chichester, Worcester, and Sarum, and of Monsieur de Luzancy. 4to. (no place) 1698. In two parts, pp. 64.]

and whether approved by any other I know not. CHAP. XI.  
 In a book<sup>n</sup> published next year, which gives an 260.  
(A.D. 360.)  
 account of the life of Thomas Firmin, and of his religion, they recite the said agreement, and discourse something more on the subject-matter of it. In the account of his religion, after having observed that the people had once thought that the difference between the Unitarians and the catholic church was ‘real, great, and even unreconcilable,’ they add;

‘But the English Unitarians (or Socinians) being  
 ‘men of ingenuous and free minds and principles,  
 ‘and therefore always ready to entertain farther  
 ‘light; after eight or nine years late contest in  
 ‘print with the principal divines of this nation, they  
 ‘have been so dexterous and happy, that instead of  
 ‘farther embroiling the points in question, which is  
 ‘the usual effect of the paper war, they seem to  
 ‘have accommodated whatsoever differences depend-  
 ‘ing between the church and them<sup>o</sup>.’

And a little after: ‘Other sects, by the favour of  
 ‘princes, or the quality of the times, have obtained  
 ‘an exemption from mulcts and penalties of the  
 ‘laws, &c.—If Socinianism had any where enjoyed  
 ‘those halcyon days, its sudden irresistible progress  
 ‘would have been—as lightning, *that rusheth out  
 ‘of the east and shineth even to the west.* Alas!  
 ‘on equal ground, and with equal circumstances,  
 ‘the combat between unintelligible mystery and  
 ‘clear reason; between seeming contradictions,

<sup>n</sup> [‘The Life of Mr. Thomas Firmin, late Citizen of London;  
 ‘with a Sermon on the Occasion of his Death. Together with  
 ‘an Account of his Religion, and of the present State of the  
 ‘Unitarian Controversy.’ 8vo. London, 1698.]

<sup>o</sup> Page 5.

CHAP. XI ‘absurdities, and impossibilities; and a rational,  
<sup>260.</sup> ‘obvious, accountable faith, would soon have been  
 (A.D. 360.) ‘ended. But it is better ended: the Divine Provi-  
 ‘dence and goodness, in mercy to both parties, has  
 ‘granted a peace instead of a victory. It has pleased  
 ‘God to favour the suffering side with an unex-  
 ‘pected light: he has shewn them (what may seem  
 ‘incredible) that their opposers think as they [the  
 ‘Unitarians] speak, that their difference is not in  
 ‘the ideas or notions, but only in the terms or  
 ‘words. To manifest this, Mr. Firmin caused the  
 ‘following scheme of agreement,’ &c.

And to this purpose in the other treatise of the said book, viz. in the Life of Mr. Firmin, they say,

‘The Unitarians never intended to oppose any  
 ‘other trinity, but a trinity of infinite minds or  
 ‘spirits. Grant to them that God is one infinite  
 ‘spirit or mind, not two or three, they demand no  
 ‘more. They applied themselves therefore to in-  
 ‘quire, which of these trinities, a trinity of spirits,  
 ‘or of properties, is the doctrine of the catholic  
 ‘church. They could not miss of a ready satisfac-  
 ‘tion: all systems, catechisms, books of controversy,  
 ‘councils, writers that have been esteemed catholic,  
 ‘——have defined God to be one infinite, all-perfect  
 ‘Spirit: and the divine Persons to be nothing else  
 ‘but the divine Essence or Godhead, with the three  
 ‘relative properties, unbegotten, and begotten, and  
 ‘proceeding<sup>P</sup>.’

It is a wonder then that these men could never perceive this before. Had they never looked into any system, catechism, council, &c., before the year 1697? they say themselves, that as soon as they set



themselves to inquire, they could not miss of a ready satisfaction. CHAP. XI.

But since they do now make a proposal of coming <sup>260.</sup> (A.D. 360.) into the communion of the church, it is not so material to inquire what was the occasion of their quarrel, as it is to know whether their return to the church be cordial; and whether they are as yet of such a faith, as that, according to this rule of St. Gregory, they ought to be admitted to baptism (those of them that are not yet baptized) or to the communion.

XIII. 1. And if they would be received as cordially joining with the catholics; why do they still speak of the divinity of Christ in so ambiguous terms as becomes not such as have lain under censure of false doctrine in that point? They repeat out of their scheme; ‘ We say our Lord Christ is ‘ God and man. He is man, in respect of his reasonable soul and human body; God, in respect of ‘ *God in him*: or more scholastically, in respect of ‘ the hypostatical or personal union, of the humanity ‘ of Christ with the divinity. By which the catholic ‘ church means, and we mean, the divinity was ‘ not only occasionally assisting to, but was and is ‘ always in Christ, illuminating, conducting, and ‘ actuating him <sup>q</sup>.’

And again, ‘ Nor do we reckon of the Lord Christ ‘ as but a creature; I have said before, he is God ‘ and man. The Divinity did so *inhabit* in the ‘ humanity of Christ, doth so exert in it the most ‘ glorious effects of Omnipotence and Omniscience, ‘ that if others have been called God because they

<sup>q</sup> Account of Firmin’s Religion, p. 18.

CHAP. XI. ‘*represented* God, Christ is to be so called because  
<sup>260.</sup> ‘*he exhibits* God<sup>r</sup>.’

(A.D. 360.)

All this, except what they say of the personal union, is lame still. For another man, as for example Moses, or any prophet that had the Spirit of God in him, illuminating, conducting, and enabling him to work miracles, &c., might be said to *exhibit* God in this sense; only not in so high a degree, or not always.

What they subscribe to of the hypostatical or personal union would indeed be firm, and for ever stop their way against returning to Socinianism, if they had expressed it scholastically as they pretend to do. I mean, if they had said this union to be of the humanity of Christ with the λόγος or second of the three Persons. But when they say, ‘with the ‘Divinity,’ they either do not understand the import of that phrase, of hypostatical or personal union; or else they purposely confound the notion. They do not mean sure, that the humanity of Christ is personally united to, or makes one person with, the Father.

160. The very doctrine for which both Paulus Samo-  
 244. satenus and Photinus were condemned by the church, was that they made Christ to be God only by the inhabitation of God in him: as bishop Stillingfleet<sup>s</sup> had fully proved to them. And yet, if you mind these men’s phrases, they own no more: and even the hypostatical union they explain to mean no more, and do without any modesty say, that the church means no more by it.

XIV. The truth is, the Socinians have very lately made a great and monstrous change in their doc-

<sup>r</sup> Page 30.

<sup>s</sup> Vindication of the Trinity, c. 4.

trine: and yet hold their main article still; that CHAP XI.  
 Christ has, properly speaking, no nature but the 260.  
 human. And these English Unitarians do by their (A.D. 360.)  
 way of explaining themselves give ground to suspect  
 that they are still in that sentiment. They were  
 wont formerly to degrade that λόγος of which St.  
 John speaks, as much as they could; making it to  
 be nothing but the human nature of Jesus Christ,  
 or something belonging to the human nature. They  
 did use to expound thus; *In the beginning was the*  
*word*: i. e. In the beginning of the gospel, Jesus  
 Christ and his preaching was. *And the word was*  
*with God*: i. e. He and his preaching were ap-  
 pointed in the council of God. *And the word was*  
*God*: i. e. He was God's deputy to men. *All things*  
*were made by him*: i. e. All matters of the gospel  
 dispensation were done by him, &c.

But now of late they put a notion on the term  
 λόγος, which carries the utmost degree of contrariety  
 to their former interpretation. They make the  
 λόγος to be not at all distinct from God the Father,  
 neither in nature nor in person: but to be his  
 attribute of wisdom, reason, &c. Thus a certain  
 writer over the water, whose works they greedily  
 translate into English<sup>t</sup>:

*In the beginning was the word*: i. e. In the  
 beginning was reason.

*And the word was with God*: i. e. And that  
 reason was with God.

*And the word was God*: i. e. And God was that  
 reason.

<sup>t</sup> [See a Supplement to Dr. Hammond's Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament: by Monsieur Le Clerc, 4to. London, 1690. p. 157, &c.]



CHAP. XI. *The same was in the beginning with God: i. e.*  
<sup>260.</sup> There was, I say, reason in God before the world  
 (A.D. 360.) was created.

Are not these great apophthegms for St. John to say?

And in the following verses, wherever we read *he* or *him*, they translate *it*. *All things were made by it: and without it was not any thing* &c. And then ver. 14, *And the word was made flesh: i. e.* And this reason, by the man in whom it was, was made conspicuous.

And where the author to the Hebrews having expressly named God's son, *whom he hath appointed heir of all things*, adds these words; *by whom also he made the worlds*: because here is no possible turning *him* into *it*, the paraphrase is; 'that is, 'having heretofore by that λόγος, or reason, or 'eternal wisdom which resided in Jesus, and was 'most nearly united to him, created all things.' If by 'most nearly united' be meant so united as to become one person, it is catholic. But the terms of residing in him, and of being made conspicuous by him, express a more lax sort of union than what the words of scripture do every where set forth. And at such a rate of interpreting it might be said of any mere man, in whom the Spirit of God does reside, that *the world was made by him*: because he has in him that Spirit by which it was made. But the scripture is far from saying so of any mere man; and of our Lord Jesus Christ it never speaks otherwise than so: *By him were all things created: and, He is before all things*<sup>u</sup>. *Of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all*<sup>x</sup>, &c. *With the*

<sup>u</sup> Col. i. 16, 17.

<sup>x</sup> Rom. ix. 5.

*glory which I had with thee before the world was*<sup>y</sup>. CHAP. XI.  
*I came forth from the Father. Before Abraham was,* <sup>260.</sup>  
*I am*<sup>z</sup>, [or was] &c. It is not said, the Spirit or <sup>(A.D. 360.)</sup>  
wisdom which is in me, came forth from the Father,  
or had glory with thee: but *I* came forth, *I* had  
glory, &c. And as far as the personal word *I* or *He*  
can denote the same person, it is here and every  
where else denoted.

The Paulianists and Photinians would say, as  
these men do, that Christ is God and man: but if  
they were asked whether he was God first, or man  
first, they would say, he was man first, and after-  
wards God, by God's dwelling in him. And these  
men seem to mean no other. But the catholic  
church believes that he was God first, and afterward  
became man. As St. John tells first what he was  
originally: and then how he was made flesh.

Cerinthus, who was St. John's chief adversary,  
and against whom he had a particular eye, when he  
wrote his Gospel (as both Irenæus<sup>a</sup> and St. Hierome<sup>b</sup>  
do witness) taught that Jesus was the son of Joseph  
and Mary in like manner as all other men: and  
that he was eminent for justice, prudence, and  
wisdom above all others: and that after his baptism  
Christ came down upon him from the Supreme  
power in the shape of a dove, &c. This was Cerin-  
thus' doctrine, as Irenæus<sup>c</sup> repeats it, who lived so  
nigh those times that he may well be thought to be  
born in the time of Cerinthus. And this is the  
same for substance with the latter of those two

<sup>y</sup> John xvii. 5.<sup>z</sup> John xvi. 28.<sup>a</sup> Lib. 3. c. 11.<sup>b</sup> De Script. Eccl. v. Joannes. [or, de Scriptoribus illustribus,  
(as this treatise is more frequently called) cap. 9. — Op. tom. ii.  
p. 830, edit. Vallars.]<sup>c</sup> Lib. i. c. 25.

CHAP. XI. sorts of Socinianism that I mentioned; only it was  
<sup>260.</sup>  
 (A.D. 360.) by him blunderingly expressed: that which they  
 style λόγος he calls Christ, and he does not allow  
 him to be born of a virgin. They must be dexterous  
 and happy men indeed, that can reconcile St. John's  
 Gospel to that very sense against which it was  
 purposely written.

This Cerinthus and Ebion, both whose doctrine  
 concerning our Lord was (as Irenæus in the next  
 chapter<sup>d</sup> testifies) the same, were the first Socinians  
 in the world, except those mentioned John vi. 42,  
 who said, *Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose  
 father and mother we know? How is it then that he  
 saith, I came down from heaven?*

XV. 2. But besides: what hopes can we have of  
 any firm union with these men, who at the same  
 time that they desire to be received into commu-  
 nion with the catholic church, do set forth the faith  
 thereof in as ill colours as possibly they can; calling  
 it 'unintelligible mystery,' and their own, 'clear  
 'reason?' That which we hold they describe as  
 'seeming impossibilities, absurdities, and contradic-  
 'tions:' theirs is a 'rational, obvious, and account-  
 'able faith.' And they express themselves as men  
 that were cocksure, that if that act of parliament,  
 which they call 'a bill in name and pretext against  
 'immorality and blasphemy, in truth and real de-  
 'sign against the Unitarians<sup>e</sup>,' were taken out of  
 the way, we should all presently turn Socinians.  
 (It is to be noted that this act came out much about  
 the same time that they were favoured with that  
 unexpected light.)

They ought not to be so hasty: there is another

<sup>d</sup> Lib. i. cap. 26.

<sup>e</sup> [Life of T. Firmin, p. 26.]



book in the way, and that is the scriptures. If they CHAP. XI.  
260.  
(A.D. 360.)  
were abolished, and other records of the church with them, we freely grant that we should not naturally have any notion of a Trinity, of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit in one Godhead; nor should we ever have thought of being baptized in such a name, nor have known of the *Word which was God, being made flesh*. These mysteries we grant would have been unintelligible.

But then there would have been another inconveniency in that way of knowing God which they propose, viz. in entertaining only such notions of him as we can form by natural reason and *clear ideas*. For some few persons of more refined intellectuals would conceive him to be a spiritual Being far above the properties and passions of body and matter. Others, that could form no notion of a spirit, would say, this is unintelligible mystery: we must have a God that has a body, or else we shall think him to be nothing. These latter would be subdivided: for some would believe that he is made of a very fine, subtle, and ethereal matter, quite different from that which may be seen, or has any limbs, &c. But others, and these the far greatest part of mankind, would contend that a God that is supposed to see, and hear, and judge, without any ears or eyes, is an absurdity, impossibility, contradiction, a thing of which we can form no *clear idea*: so they would have a God with eyes and ears as good as any painter could make.

The experience of all ages of the world shews that what I say is no fancy, but matter of fact. This way therefore would not do, except they would join to it the policy of the papists, who do preserve

CHAP. XI. the true notion of God, as he is set forth in scripture, for the use of the learned and such as they allow to read the scripture; but keep at the same time wooden gods for the use of the mob.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

God Almighty give us all the modesty and humility to think that his way of existing may well be such as we cannot comprehend, any more than a worm can comprehend what reason or speech or a soul is: and quietly to acquiesce in that account which he has been pleased to give of his own nature, and of what we are to believe concerning him: and to take it according to the plain meaning of those whom he has inspired to write it: and to judge ourselves, as we are indeed, far incapable of explaining the manner of it; and much more incapable of any ability of trying and examining the truth of it by our natural ideas of the things themselves. This last is impudent in those who do own the divine inspiration of the writers.

XVI. The great progress which they boast they should make, has no example for their encouragement in former ages of the church. Cerinthus and Ebion had some followers; but that was before the canon of scripture, and particularly St. John's Gospel, was completed and divulged; and it was mostly in wild countries, as Arabia deserta<sup>f</sup>, &c. After the writings of the apostles were divulged, several single persons, Artemon, Theodotus, Paulus of Samosata, &c., attempted to set up such a sect, but never proselyted any region or city: and Photinus, though a very eloquent man, and setting up in the Arian times, was presently condemned by all parties: so that Epiphanius, who wrote but thirty years after that

<sup>80.</sup>

<sup>160.</sup>

<sup>245.</sup>

<sup>275.</sup>

<sup>f</sup> Epiphan. in Hær. Ebionitarum.

he began to vent his heresy, and before Photinus CHAP. XI.  
 himself was dead, as it seems, tells him, that ‘his <sup>260.</sup>  
 ‘heresy of all others was the easiest to be confuted, (A.D. 360.)  
 ‘not only by skilful men, but by any that had any  
 ‘tolerable understanding of the sense of scripture <sup>g.</sup>  
 And a little after: ‘The heresy of this impostor is  
 ‘dwindled away, having lasted but a very little  
 ‘while.’ And Theodoret says, that ‘in his time it  
 ‘was quite forgot;’ and so, he says, were ‘all the  
 ‘other heresies that had denied Christ’s divinity,  
 ‘Cerinthians, Ebionites, Sabellians, &c., so that the  
 ‘very names of those sects were to many unknown <sup>h.</sup>  
 And whereas one Bonosus <sup>i.</sup>, about, or a little after  
 the time of Photinus, went about to vent the same  
 doctrine in Dacia, he was so far from having any  
 number of followers, that he himself or his name is  
 hardly known in history; and Theodoret seems  
 never to have heard of him.

Mahomet the impostor, arising in the foresaid  
 Arabia, (of which place Epiphanius says, ‘It was  
 ‘the chief nest of the Ebionites and Nazarenes, as  
 ‘I have,’ says he, ‘often already observed <sup>k.</sup>’) was  
 the only man that after these times ventured to  
 broach the doctrine against Christ’s divinity: and  
 he indeed with his successors have converted a great  
 part of the world ‘with a sudden irresistible pro-  
 ‘gress:’ but then they have accordingly laid aside  
 the name of Christians, and disowned the scriptures,  
 as being plainly against them in this matter, though  
 they do believe Christ to have been a great Pro-  
 phet.

<sup>g</sup> Hær. 71.

<sup>h</sup> Hæret. Fab. lib. ii. cap. ult.

<sup>i</sup> Mercator, Dissert. contra Anathematismos Nestorii. 522.

<sup>k</sup> Hær. 40.



CHAP. XI.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

Since that, in Poland, and such places bordering on the Mahometans, this opinion has been entertained by some few as a middle sort of religion between the Christian and Mahometan. And now of late it is come into Holland, and from thence into England, serving for the use of such as being staggered in their faith by the arguments of the deists, which are rife in those countries, yet will not go so far with them as to renounce Jesus Christ and the scriptures; but take a middle way, holding with the catholics that he is a true prophet, and the Messiah promised, and that he died and rose again, and will be our Judge; but with the deists denying his divinity, and holding that he had no being before he was born or conceived in human flesh. They with the catholics say that the scriptures are (originally and as they came out of the apostles' hands) God's word, and not feigned by men; but with the deists, that what they say of Christ's divinity has been interpolated, or must be explained so as to fit with our natural conceptions, which, they say, cannot admit the notion of a Son of God that is properly one in essence with the Father, nor of such a Son of God taking on him the human nature, when the Father does not. To believe such strange things on the credit of revelation, is, they say, to give great advantage to the deists who deny it all.

This opinion, I say, never had any considerable number of followers in the world. The Arian, I grant, had; but that does not nigh so plainly contradict the scriptures.

XVII. Now to return to that which gave the occasion of this digression: The catholics, as we see here by Gregory Nazianzen, would not baptize or

receive to their church an Arian, nor any one that CHAP. XI.  
 did not profess belief in the holy Trinity and the 260.  
 divinity of Christ. The catholic church is of the (A.D. 360.)  
 same mind still. These men do make an overture, and a declaration of their purpose of joining themselves to the church, and they do many of them put it in practice. If they are truly reconciled to the catholic faith, nothing were more desirable : but for that there is need of a better test, and it is a question whether the church ought to receive them without better satisfaction than this scheme of agreement. They own the Apostles' Creed indeed, which our church makes use of in baptism : but by disowning the Nicene, they shew that they do not own the other in the same sense that the church does, but repeat the same words in a very equivocal meaning. When we say, 'I believe in Jesus Christ ' his only Son,' &c., we do by the phrase of believing *in* him, mean believing in him as in God properly so called : and so we understand likewise the form of baptism in his name, together with the Father and Holy Spirit. And so did the ancients : this Gregory, speaking of the Holy Spirit, and how we are baptized in his name, 'If he be a creature,' says he, 'how do we believe in him? For it is one thing ' to believe *in* any one, and another to believe some-  
 ' thing *concerning* him. For the one is peculiar to  
 ' God : the other common to any thing<sup>1</sup>.' If these men mean quite another thing in both these, I cannot see how we and they have *one faith* or *one baptism* ; nor indeed how we worship the same God : for the God whom we worship is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

<sup>1</sup> Orat. de Spiritu Sancto.

CHAP. XI. A difference in understanding the meaning of some  
<sup>260.</sup>  
 (A.D. 360.) articles of lesser moment, viz. of Christ's descent into hell, is not of the same nature, nor does make an instance for this purpose. If any man differ in opinion from the received tenets of the church in smaller matters, and therefore cannot join in some particular collect, office, prayer, or clause of a prayer, wherein something relating to those tenets is expressed, we grant, what these men plead, that St. Paul's rule, *If in any thing ye be otherwise minded, God shall reveal even this unto you. Nevertheless whereto we have attained, let us walk by the same rule<sup>m</sup>, &c.*, teaches that such a man should continue in communion, and conform to all that he can, and omit the saying Amen to that which he judges a mistake. Bp. Stillingfleet<sup>n</sup> has fully proved this to be the meaning of that place against the dissenting ministers, who were not willing that the separation should sink so. And we can well enough allow of Mr. le Clerc's explication of Rom. xiv. 1. 'Him that 'is weak in the faith, receive you without examining his doubtful opinions,' and that the church ought to receive such an one. But all this is in differences about such matters as St. Paul there instances, in meats, drinks, or other things not of the foundation. But the doctrine concerning the person of Jesus Christ, and the satisfaction for our sins by him made, is, if any thing be, of the foundation.

I think the church of England has at this time the worst luck in this respect that any church ever had. There are numerous bodies of her people who hold all the same faith with her, that do against her

<sup>m</sup> Phil. iii. 15, 16.

<sup>n</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, p. ii. §. 19.



will make schisms from her communion on occasion of differences in opinion, which are no just ground for separation, which party soever be supposed to be in the right. These she calls and invites to communion in prayers and sacraments, in which they might join even on supposal that they could not part with their particular opinions: and they, either out of peevishness, or else being over-persuaded by their leaders, who find their account in continuing separate bodies whereof they may be heads, do refuse to join even in those things wherein they agree in opinion with us. On the other side, these men who give but a poor account of their agreement with us in fundamentals, declare of their own accord (whether it be to shelter themselves from penalties, or not, I know not) that they will however join with us.

The least that can be said is, that it behoves every curate, who has good ground to believe concerning any of those that resort to his communion, that they are enemies to the doctrine of the divinity of our Saviour (and there are up and down more of them than one would think), to take advice of the bishop how far such are to be admitted to communion.

XVIII. I mentioned the satisfaction of our Saviour for our sins. It is known how derogatory an explication the Socinians have given of that. They have sometimes so spoke, as if the main or only design of his death were to give us a good example of suffering patiently; fearing that if too much value were put on his blood as a sufficient ransom for the sins of the world, it must be yielded to be the blood of one that was God in a proper sense as well as

CHAP. XI.

260.

(A. D. 360.)

CHAP. XI. man. But whereas the New Testament does almost  
 260.  
 (A.D. 360.) in every chapter speak of the redemption, propi-  
 tiation, sacrifice, price, ransom, purchase, paid or  
 wrought by him, and does lay the stress of our sal-  
 vation upon our *faith in his blood*<sup>o</sup> as well as in his  
 doctrine: they do (after having explained away as  
 much of this article as possibly they can) yield that  
 he did satisfy for us a little, or redeem us a little.  
 I have heard one of them in company, and in a  
 braving way, explain it thus; ‘It is as if a man  
 ‘ owed me a thousand pounds, and not being able to  
 ‘ pay, a friend of his, who had some interest in me,  
 ‘ should intercede with me to forgive him the debt;  
 ‘ and to move me the more, should offer to pay  
 ‘ twelvepence in the pound for him, and I in con-  
 ‘ descension to this friend should accept it for pay-  
 ‘ ment in full.’

This is to count *the blood of the covenant where-  
 with we are sanctified*<sup>p</sup> a much more mean and or-  
 dinary thing than the scripture does every where  
 represent it. And that which brought this passage  
 of a discourse in company to my memory, was the  
 words which these men use<sup>q</sup> to shew the soundness  
 of their faith in that matter; ‘We believe that the  
 ‘ Lord Christ by what he did, and what he suffered,  
 ‘ was,’ by the gracious acceptance of God, ‘a true  
 ‘ and perfect propitiation for sinners that repent.’  
 This is what any catholic or any Socinian either,  
 may say, and yet have a very different faith about  
 this article.

The other errors with which they are charged,

<sup>o</sup> Rom. iii. 24, 25.

<sup>p</sup> Heb. x. 29.

<sup>q</sup> [Account of Firmin’s Religion, p. 19.]

and do not by that agreement revoke, are great; CHAP. XI.  
but not to be named the same day with these.

XIX. As for the assemblies which they talk of 260.  
(A.D. 360.)  
holding ‘for divine worship distinct from the as-  
semblies of any other denominations of Christians :  
‘but these to be not by the way of schism or sepa-  
ration from the church, but only as fraternities in  
the church, who should take a more special care of  
that article,’ [viz. of the unity of the Godhead,]  
there would be by God’s grace no need of them.  
The catholic church does, and ever did, and ever  
will hold and publish that doctrine in the first  
place and above all others. The Athanasian Creed,  
against which they make their chief exceptions, de-  
clares this in words as absolute as any they can de-  
sire to be devised ; that though the Father be God,  
Lord, Almighty, &c., and the Son and Holy Spirit  
likewise; yet there are not three Gods, Lords, Al-  
mighties, &c., but one God, one Lord, one Almighty :  
and would by parity of reason have said; so the  
Father is Spirit, the Son Spirit, and the Holy Ghost  
Spirit: yet not three Spirits, but one Spirit.

XX. They confess themselves that all systems,  
catechisms, councils, have defined this. But they  
add, ‘especially since the Lateran council,’ &c.,  
thereby leaving open a door for that slander of a  
friend<sup>r</sup> of theirs to take place, who goes about to  
make the world believe that anciently, in the times  
of the Nicene council, and for some time afterward,  
the Christians held the faith of the Trinity so as to  
make three Gods in it.

This slander of an outlandish author, our Soci-

<sup>r</sup> Mr. Le Clerc, Supplement to Hammond; item Critical  
Epistles, &c.



CHAP. XI. nians do greedily embrace and confidently aver :  
<sup>260.</sup>  
 (A.D. 360.) which has, as to most of the particulars by which they would prove it, been fully answered by bishop Stillingfleet<sup>s</sup>: and I have occasionally, in another place<sup>t</sup> said something to some of the rest on which they insist, and to that open affront given by the said slanderer to all the churches that use the Nicene Creed, which he says they must either expunge out of their confessions and liturgies, or else renounce the article of one God, pretending that the faith held forth in that creed is Tritheism. But it comes in my way there by the by only.

All that I mention it here for, is to shew what an antipathy this sort of men have to that creed, and how they accordingly endeavour to blacken it: which is, as I shew in another place<sup>u</sup>, the most ancient copy of a Christian creed that is now extant in the world, and the most universally subscribed to by all Christians, and has been now for so many ages accounted the only firm test and barrier of the catholic church against such as deny the divinity of our Lord Christ: being of opinion, that we can have no sound communion with those that renounce it: and that it is a vain and ill advised thing to hope in these late ages of the church to pitch or agree on any fitter symbol or test of a catholic Christian. It should be the more unexceptionable with them, because it has not the words, *Trinity*, *person*, &c., against which their objections chiefly lie. And yet those of them among us that do put in practice the foresaid project of communicating with the church, do, as far as I understand, gene-

<sup>s</sup> Vindication of the Trinity, ch. 6.

<sup>t</sup> Part ii. ch. 5. §. 8.

<sup>u</sup> Part ii. ch. 9. § 9, 10, 11, &c.

rally renounce it, and instead of it they give here a  
 profession of their faith, in words subject to great  
 ambiguity. CHAP. XI.  
 260.  
 (A.D. 360.)

The great bishop Stillington<sup>x</sup> having occasion to speak of that canon<sup>y</sup> of the first council of Arles, wherein they decree, That if any that come over from a sort of heresy there specified, did offer themselves to communicate with the catholics, ‘they should be examined by the priests, whether they had a right faith of the Trinity,’ &c. And if so, they were to be admitted with imposition of hands. ‘But if being examined, they do not confess this Trinity, then they must be baptized anew.’ He asks this question, ‘What Trinity do they mean? of mere names or cyphers, or of one God and two creatures joined in the same form of words, as our Unitarians understand it?’

And to the same purpose St. Cyprian, arguing that such as had received baptism from some heretics that had monstrous opinions about the Deity, ought not to be admitted to communion without a new baptism, says thus: ‘If by that baptism of theirs the man have obtained remission of sins, then is he sanctified and become a temple of God. Now I ask of what God? If they say of God the Creator, that could not be, since he did not believe in him. If of Christ; one that denies Christ to be God cannot be a temple of him. If of the Holy Spirit; whereas these three are one, how can the Holy Spirit be pleased with him who is against either the Father or the Son<sup>z</sup>?’

We may by the by take notice, that it appears by

<sup>x</sup> Vindication of the Trinity, ch. 9.

<sup>y</sup> Can. 8.

<sup>z</sup> Epist. 73. ad Jubaianum.

CHAP. XI. this and by another plainer place of St. Cyprian<sup>a</sup>,  
<sup>260.</sup> that that text of St. John, *These three are one*<sup>b</sup>,  
 (A.D. 360.) either was read then (which was long before the  
 time of Arius) with the same context that it is  
 now, or at least was understood in the same sense.

If these ancient Christians would not admit such  
 men, though recanting their opinions, without a  
 new baptism; I mean, if they had been baptized  
 into any other faith than the true faith of the Tri-  
 nity; much less would they have entertained com-  
 munion with them holding still their opinions.

It is St. Gregory's mentioning in this oration of  
 baptism a thing that is so applicable to the case of  
 the church at present, that has drawn me so far  
 from my subject.

## CHAP. XII.

### *Quotations out of St. Basil.*

§. I. ST. BASIL also has an oration or sermon  
 to the catechumens, or new converted Christians, to  
 persuade them to baptism without such delays as  
 many used: but it has not any express mention of  
 the case of infants as to baptism: yet it has some  
 things that are cited *pro* and *contra* to that pur-  
 pose. It may not be amiss to give a short abstract  
 of it, reciting, as I did in the other, the original  
 words of such places only as do by some consequence  
 relate to this question.

#### *Oratio Exhortatoria ad Baptismum.*<sup>c</sup> [§. 1.]

He begins with observing, that Solomon, mention-  
 ing a time for every thing, says, *There is a time to*

<sup>a</sup> Lib. de Unitate Ecclesiæ.

<sup>b</sup> 1 John v. 7.

<sup>c</sup> [Tom. ii. p. 113. edit. Benedictin. Paris, 1721.]



*be born, and a time to die*, placing the birth first: CHAP. XII.  
 but that he being to speak of the spiritual birth, \_\_\_\_\_  
 must speak of our spiritual death first. Which <sup>260.</sup>  
 (A.D. 360.) having done, and shewn the lost condition we are  
 in by nature, and that baptism is the recovery from  
 it, he proceeds:

II. Καιρὸς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἄλλος ἐπιτήδειος ἴδιος  
 ὕπνου, καὶ ἴδιος ἐγρηγόρσεως ἴδιος πολέμου, καὶ ἴδιος  
 εἰρήνης. Καιρὸς δὲ βαπτίσματος ἅπας ὁ τῶν ἀνθρώπων  
 βίος. ‘There is therefore a several season proper  
 ‘for several things; a time peculiar for sleep, and  
 ‘one peculiar for watching; a time for war, and a  
 ‘time for peace. But any time of one’s life is  
 ‘proper for baptism.’ And afterward, ‘Be it day  
 ‘or night, be it but an hour or a minute, yet the  
 ‘most proper time is Easter: for that is the so-  
 ‘lemnity of the resurrection; and baptism is to us  
 ‘a ground of our resurrection.’

III. Then having insisted on the advantage of  
 Christ’s baptism above that of St. John’s, and how  
 all are invited to it; he addresses thus to them:  
 Ὅκνεῖς καὶ βουλεύη καὶ διαμέλλεις; ἐκ νηπίου τὸν λόγον  
 κατηχούμενος οὕτω συνέθου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; πάντοτε μαν-  
 θάνων, οὐδέπω ἤλθες πρὸς τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν; πειραστῆς διὰ  
 βίου, κατὰσκοπος μέχρι γήρως; πότε γενήσῃ χριστιανός;  
 πότε γνωρίσομέν σε ὡς ἡμέτερον; &c. ‘Do you demur  
 ‘and loiter, and put it off? When you have been  
 ‘from a child catechised in the word, are you not  
 ‘yet acquainted with the truth? Having been  
 ‘always learning it, are you not yet come to the  
 ‘knowledge of it? A seeker all your life long, a  
 ‘considerer till you are old, when will you be made  
 ‘a Christian? When shall we see you become one  
 ‘of us? Last year you were for staying till this year:

CHAP. ' and now you have a mind to stay till next. Take  
 XII. ' heed that by promising yourself a longer life, you  
 260.  
 (A.D. 360.) ' do not quite miss of your hope. You do not know  
 ' what change to-morrow may bring,' &c.

IV. When I first copied out this passage to put it into this collection, I thought it to be the strongest evidence against the general practice of infant-baptism in those times of any that is to be found in all antiquity, (though it has not, I think, been taken notice of by any of the antipædobaptists,) for it plainly supposes that a considerable part of St. Basil's auditory at this time were such as had been from their childhood instructed in the Christian religion (and consequently in all probability born of Christian parents), and yet not baptized.

But I have since, in searching after other passages, had occasion more than enough to observe, that there were in these times abundance of people that were well-willers to Christianity, half Christians, who yet put off their absolute owning of it, or being baptized into it, for a great many years. These men had, during that their unsettled mind, several children: and they could not with any face or conscience desire of the church baptism for these their infant-children, unless they would first find in their hearts to accept it for themselves. And so these children came to be taught the doctrine of Christianity, and yet not baptized into it; because their parents, though liking of that religion, yet were not at present fully resolved themselves. But this is no proof that any Christians, after they were once baptized themselves, did ever suffer their infant children to go without baptism.

This place itself is a plain proof that there were

a great many such men as I have mentioned: for several of the men to whom St. Basil is here preaching, and whom he blames for putting off baptism so long, must be thought to have children; which children must be in the case that I speak of. So that this place affords an answer to the objection drawn from itself, or from any other that speaks of children instructed in religion and yet not baptized.

CHAP.  
XII.

260.  
(A.D. 360.)

V. He goes on with his sermon, and shews the advantages of this profession to which he invites them, and the lightness of the yoke which he advises them to put on. And proceeds to speak of the necessity of baptism in these words: [§. 2.]

‘Ο Ἰουδαῖος τὴν περιτομὴν οὐκ ὑπερτίθεται διὰ τὴν ἀπειλὴν, ὅτι πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἣτις οὐ περιτμηθήσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτῆς. σὺ δὲ τὴν ἀχειροποίητον περιτομὴν ἀναβάλλῃ ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τῆς σαρκὸς, ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι τελειουμένην, αὐτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἀκούσας, Ἀμὴν, Ἀμὴν, &c. ‘A Jew ‘does not delay circumcision because of the threatening that *every soul that is not circumcised the eighth day shall be cut off from his people*: and ‘dost thou put off the circumcision made without hands in the putting off the flesh, which is performed in baptism, when thou hearest our Lord himself say, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except one be born of water and of the spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God*? If Israel had not passed through the sea, they had not got rid of Pharaoh: and unless thou pass through the water, thou wilt not be delivered from the cruel tyranny of the Devil,’ &c.

‘If your sins are many; be not frightened because of their number: where sin has abounded, there



CHAP. XII. ‘ grace will much more abound, if you will receive  
 XII. ‘ it. If they are small and not very heinous, why

<sup>260.</sup>  
 (A.D. 360.) ‘ are you afraid of the time to come, since you have  
 ‘ ordered your past life well, even when you were not  
 ‘ furnished with the Christian law?’ [§. 3.]

VI. ‘ Look upon your soul to be placed in a  
 ‘ balance ; the angels draw you one way, the devils  
 ‘ the other : to which will you incline ? Which shall  
 ‘ overcome, carnal pleasure or holiness of life ?

‘ Do not you remember how in Egypt the de-  
 ‘ stroyer passed over the houses that were marked,  
 ‘ when in those that were not so he slew the first-  
 ‘ born ?

‘ If a physician could undertake by any art to  
 ‘ make you young again when you are old, you  
 ‘ would earnestly long for that day in which your  
 ‘ florid youth should be restored : and yet now when  
 ‘ it is told you that your soul, defiled with all manner  
 ‘ of sin, may be renewed and born again by baptism,  
 ‘ you slight so great a benefit.’ [§. 4.]

‘ Are you young ? guard your youth with the  
 ‘ bridle of baptism. Is the flower of your age past ?  
 ‘ do not endanger the loss of your viaticum ; do not  
 ‘ miss of your preservative ; do not miss of your  
 ‘ eleventh hour as if it were your first.

‘ I know your reason, though you think to conceal  
 ‘ it. “ Stay a little longer,” say you, “ I will make use  
 ‘ of the flower of my age in pleasure, &c., and then  
 ‘ when I have enough of that, I will give it over and  
 ‘ be baptized.” Think you that God does not see  
 ‘ your purpose, or that he will give his grace to so  
 ‘ wicked a heart ?——If you leave off your sins for  
 ‘ old age, thanks to your inability. We regard those  
 ‘ that are sober by choice, not by necessity.

‘ Who has given you a lease of your life?’ &c. CHAP.  
XII.  
 ‘ Do not you see children often snatched from the  
 ‘ breast, and others die in the flower of their <sup>260.</sup>  
 ‘ age?’ &c. (A.D. 360.)

‘ Do you stay for baptism till some fever force  
 ‘ you to it, when you will neither be able to speak  
 ‘ the holy words, nor perhaps to hear them, the dis-  
 ‘ ease being got into your head?’ [§. 5.]

The Devil cries, *Give me to-day, and give the  
 morrow to God.* But God says, *To-day if you will  
 hear my voice.* ‘ The Devil gives us hope of to-  
 ‘ morrow; but when to-morrow is come, as a  
 ‘ fraudulent divider, he again asks that day for  
 ‘ himself, and yields the next to-morrow to God.’  
 [§. 6.]

‘ The sanctification of baptism you commend in  
 ‘ words, but in your deeds you follow the things  
 ‘ that yoursclf condemn. Take heed you do not re-  
 ‘ pent of this purpose when it is too late, and will  
 ‘ do you no good. Learn wisdom by the example  
 ‘ of the foolish virgins,’ &c.

‘ Do not you, brother, in like manner put off  
 ‘ from year to year, from month to month, from day  
 ‘ to day, till a day seize you that you are not aware  
 ‘ of, and the opportunity of well-doing fail you to-  
 ‘ gether with your life,’ &c.

‘ Then you will lament at your very soul, but no-  
 ‘ body will pity you: you will utter dreadful moans,  
 ‘ but they will be taken for a delirium. Who will  
 ‘ give you baptism at such a time? &c. and perhaps  
 ‘ it will be night, and nobody present to help you  
 ‘ or baptize you.

‘ But you say, “ God will then hear me.” Yes, be-  
 ‘ cause you hear him now. “ He will grant me some

CHAP. XII. 'longer time.' Good reason, because you make so  
 'good use of what he does grant you.' [§. 7.]

<sup>260.</sup>  
 (A.D. 360.) 'Wretch, do not deceive yourself: let nobody se-  
 'duce you with vain words, sudden destruction will  
 'come upon you, and ruin like a storm,' &c. 'The  
 'dreadful angel will fetch away your soul,' &c.

'What thoughts will you have then? "Fool that  
 'I was! Why did not I put off this heavy load of  
 'sin then when I might easily? that I did not wash  
 'off these foul stains? &c. Oh woeful purpose of  
 'mine! for the short pleasure of sin to suffer eternal  
 'torments. I might now have been one of those  
 'that shine in glory. Oh just judgment of God! I  
 'was called and would not hear.'" &c.

'These and such like complaints you will make  
 'then, if you depart hence before you be baptized,'  
 &c. [§. 8.]

All the rest is such like pathetic exhortation  
 to break off sin, and enter without delay into the  
 Christian covenant: and were very proper to be  
 used to those who nowadays put off repentance to a  
 death-bed.

VII. St. Basil has also two other<sup>d</sup> pieces about  
 baptism, written at the desire of some that put  
 questions to him, some concerning baptism, and  
 some on other subjects (being probably persons that  
 were preparing themselves to be baptized). But all  
 the discourse is (as the occasion was) of what is  
 proper for adult persons to know and consider,  
 when they come to be baptized: and has nothing  
 that peculiarly concerns infants.

He puts these persons in mind ὅτι δεῖ πρῶτον μαθη-  
 τευθῆναι τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ τότε καταξιοθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου

<sup>d</sup> Lib. primus et secundus de baptismo. [Tom. ii. p. 624, &c.]



βαπτίσματος, ‘that they must be first instructed, and  
 ‘then admitted to baptism.’ [Lib. i. c. 2. §. 1.] (These  
 words taken by themselves, some cite as making <sup>260.</sup> (A.D. 360.)  
 against infant baptism) that they must resolve to  
 forsake, not some sins, but all. He shews them the  
 difference of three sorts of baptism, viz. that of  
 Moses, that of John, and that of Christ. The bap-  
 tism of Moses made a difference of sins; for all  
 sins were not forgiven by it. It required sacrifices  
 to be joined with it. It stood strictly on outward  
 cleansing. It enjoined an unclean person to con-  
 tinue separate for some time; depended upon days  
 and hours, &c. The baptism of John had none of  
 these inconveniences: yet he shews how that also is  
 far surpassed by that of Christ.

VIII. Coming to a more particular explication of  
 our Saviour’s words, John iii. 3, 5. of being *born  
 again*, he says, ‘I take that word [*ἄνωθεν*, again] to  
 ‘signify the rectifying of our former birth, which  
 ‘was in the filth of sin: as Job says; *no person is  
 ‘clean from sin, though his life be but of one day;*  
 ‘[so they read that text of Job<sup>e</sup>]; and as David  
 ‘laments and says, *I was conceived in iniquity, and  
 ‘in sin did my mother bring me forth.*’ [I. c. 2.  
 §. 7.]

IX. There is a passage in a sermon of St. Basil’s  
 (that which he preached on a fast-day, that was  
 kept for the great famine and drought) of which I  
 have not skill enough to judge whether it be a proof  
 of infants’ baptism then used or not. The judgment  
 of it depends on one’s knowing particularly to what  
 part of the public divine service and prayers people  
 were wont to be admitted before they were baptized;

<sup>e</sup> Job xiv. 4.

CHAP.  
XII.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

and to what not; for St. Basil speaks here of little boys and young children joining in the prayers. I know that some have written accurately the history of the catechumens, and in what parts of the Liturgy they did partake. But the passage being short, I can sooner set it down at adventure (that so they that are skilled in that matter may judge whether it be to purpose or not) than I can at present have recourse to those writings.

It is this. He is telling them that their continuance in their sins hindered their prayers from being heard. But besides, says he, ‘What sort of prayer is it that we make? The grown men, all but a few, follow their trades, &c. a very few are left to join with me in the prayers; and those lazy and yawning, and staring about,’ &c. οἱ δὲ δὴ παῖδες οἱ σμικρότατοι οὗτοι, οἱ τὰς δέλτους ἐν τοῖς διδασκαλείοις ἀποθέμενοι καὶ συμβοῶντες ἡμῖν, ὥς ἄνεσιν μᾶλλον καὶ τέρψιν τὸ πρᾶγμα μετέρχονται, &c. ἀναίσθητα δὲ καὶ ἄμεμπτα βρέφη πρὸς τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν ἐπείγεται καὶ ἀθροίζεται, οὔτε τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν λυπούντων, οὔτε τοῦ συνήθως προσεύξασθαι γινῶσιν ἢ δύναμιν ἔχοντα. σὺ μοὶ πάρελθε εἰς μέσον, &c. ‘And these little boys that have left their books at school, and do make the responses together [or sing together] with us, do it as a piece of pleasure, and the work of a play-day,’ &c. ‘And the infants that have no sense, nor any guilt, they also are brought thick and in crowds to the public confession, who neither understand the occasion of the grief, nor are capable of praying accordingly. Come yourselves to the office, you that have the load of sins upon you. It is you that ought to prostrate yourselves, to mourn and weep,’ &c. ἔδει δὲ παρεῖναι κακείμενον, μετὰ σοῦ πάντως, οὐ μόνον. ‘They

‘ [the infants] ought to be present indeed, but to come  
‘ along with you, and not alone by themselves<sup>f</sup>.’

C H A P.  
XII.

If the catechumens did not use to be admitted  
before their baptism to those parts of the office, that  
consisted in psalmody and making the responses ;  
then it is a sign that these little boys had been  
baptized. But if they did, it is only my labour  
lost in reciting it here. P. S. I am since certified  
by a very learned man, that these children must  
have been baptized.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

X. But a more material evidence than any that  
can be found in St. Basil’s writings is taken from  
his practice : of which there is an authentical record  
given by Theodoret and other historians that lived  
but a little after St. Basil, in reference to the  
baptizing of a child of Valens the emperor. This  
emperor, being an Arian, and having been prevailed  
on by the Arians to take an oath<sup>g</sup> that he would  
always maintain that faith, and persecute the con-  
trary, viz. that of the catholics, did accordingly,  
and raised great persecution against all the catholic  
bishops in his dominion, and particularly against  
St. Basil, who was bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia.  
But having great afflictions in his family at the same  
time, which looked like judgments ; and among the  
rest, his only child sick and at the point of death ;  
he was wrought on, partly by the guilt of his con-  
science, and partly by his wife’s entreaty, to abate  
of the rigour which he was then using against  
St. Basil, who was by all looked on as a pious and  
good man. And he also sent for him to come and

<sup>f</sup> [Homil. dicta tempore famis et siccitatis ; Op. tom. ii. p.  
62, &c.—§. 3.]

<sup>g</sup> Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. c. 12.



CHAP. XII. pray for his child. And then (as Theodoret<sup>h</sup> proceeds to relate the matter), ὁ μέγας Βασίλειος κατα-

<sup>260.</sup> λαβὼν τὰ βασίλεια, καὶ τὸν τοῦ βασιλέως υἱὸν παρ' (A.D. 360.) αὐτὴν ὄντα τὴν τελευταίην θεασάμενος, πρὸς τὴν ζωὴν τοῦτον ὑποστρέψειν ὑπέσχετο, εἰ τοῦ παναγίου βαπτίσματος διὰ τῶν εὐσεβούντων ἀξιωθείη. καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐξελήλυθεν. Ὁ δὲ τῶν ὄρκων κατὰ τὸν ἀνόητον μεμνημένος Ἡρώδην, τοῖς συμπαροῦσιν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς συμμορίας Ἀρείου βαπτίσει τὸ παιδίον προσέταξεν. 'The great Basil coming ' into the palace, and seeing the emperor's son at the ' point of death, undertook that he would recover if ' he had baptism given him by the hands of the ' godly [meaning the catholics]; and having said ' this he went away. But he [the emperor] remem- ' bering, like foolish Herod, his oath, gave order to ' some that were present of the faction of Arius, to ' baptize the child,' &c.

The issue was, the child died, and Valens for the present repented both of his oath and cruelty, and went to St. Basil's church, and made his oblations: but afterward he revolted to his former temper.

All that is doubtful in this passage is, whether this child were so young as that his baptism deserves to be called infant-baptism; or whether he were of such age as to be capable to be baptized on his own profession. Theodoret, we see, calls him *παιδίον*, which properly signifies *a little child* or *infant*; and is the same word that is used Mark x. 13. *προσέφερον παιδία*, *They brought young children*, and Matt. ii. 11. *εὑρον τὸ παιδίον*, *They found the young child wrapped in swaddling clothes*. Gregory Nazianzen<sup>i</sup> says that he was there present with St. Basil at

<sup>h</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. cap. 19. [p. 174, edit. Valesii, 1673.]

<sup>i</sup> Orat. in Basilium.

that time: and he compares the emperor's afflicting himself for his child to David's, for his in the like case, but mentions not the age. Socrates<sup>k</sup> calls him *νήπιον υἱὸν τοῦ Οὐάλεντος*, 'the infant son of Valens.'

CHAP.  
XII.

<sup>260.</sup>  
(A.D. 360.)

But there is among the works of Ephraem Syrus, published in Latin, a sermon on St. Basil, in which he mentions this story; but speaks so of the child, as if he had some understanding of religion: for he makes Basil covenant with Valens; 'If you will so deliver him to me, that I may bring him to the true faith, and free him from the impiety of the Arian doctrine,' &c. And again, 'They [the Arians] baptized him with water, but not with the Spirit, for they taught him to reject the Son of God,' &c. But the works of this Father which we have are of such doubtful credit (they must first have been translated out of Syriac; for he understood no other language, and they abound with very frivolous stories) that a quotation out of them cannot come in competition with the received historians.

XI. Valesius<sup>l</sup> has gone about to find out by chronological characters the age of this child when he died; not in any inquiry about infant-baptism, but to set some passages right in chronology. He makes him to be six years old. The proofs of it are something forced, and are too nice and far from our purpose to be repeated here. He judges that it was he that was consul A.D. 369, with Victor, (though the name there be Valentinian, and the historians call this child's name Galates,) and that

<sup>k</sup> Hist. lib. iv. c. 26.

<sup>l</sup> Annot. in Socrat. lib. iv. cap. 10. item 26.

CHAP. XII.  
 (A.D.<sup>260.</sup>360.) Socrates mistook Valentinian the younger for this child: and that it was on him that Themistius made that consular oration (for the flattery of that time was to make emperors' infant children consuls, and speak orations to them), where he says, 'Even while 'you are carried in people's arms, you make war 'together with your father.'

But suppose it were so, he must yet be baptized with the form of infant-baptism; for a child of six years old is capable of no other. And if he were so old as six years, he must be born before his father was baptized into the Christian religion himself. For by this account this child was born to Valens before the victory over Procopius the usurper, and so Valesius owns. Now that victory was before the beginning of Valens' war against the Goths: and it was in that war that he being minded to go to battle in person, 'thought not fit to go unprovided of the 'divine grace, but to guard himself with the armour 'of baptism<sup>m</sup>.' And if the child were born before his father was baptized, that might be the reason that he was not baptized quickly after his birth.

---

### CHAP. XIII.

*Quotations out of St. Ambrose.*

*Ambrosius, Comment. lib. i. in Sti. Lucæ cap. 1.*

[§. 37.]

<sup>274.</sup>  
 (A.D. 374.) §. I. HE is there commenting on those words, Luke i. 17, where the angel prophesies of John the Baptist, *He shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias.* And after having shewn in several

<sup>m</sup> Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib. iv. cap. 11, 12.



particulars how John in his office did resemble Elias, and having mentioned that miracle of Elias of dividing the river Jordan, he adds these words : CHAP.  
XIII.  

---

274.  
(A.D. 374.)

‘Sed fortasse hoc supra nos et supra apostolos  
‘videatur exemplum. Nam et ille sub Elia diviso  
‘amne fluvialium recursus undarum in originem  
‘fluminis (sicut dicit scriptura, Jordanes conversus  
‘est retrorsum) significat salutaris lavacri futura  
‘mysteria; per quæ in primordia naturæ suæ, qui  
‘baptizati fuerint parvuli a malitia reformantur.’

‘But perhaps this may seem to be fulfilled<sup>n</sup> in  
‘our time and in the apostles’ time. For that re-  
‘turning of the river waters backward toward the  
‘spring head, which was caused by Elias when the  
‘river was divided (as the scripture says, *Jordan*  
‘*was driven back*), signified the sacrament of the  
‘laver of salvation, which was afterward to be in-  
‘stituted; by which those infants that are baptized  
‘are reformed back again from wickedness [or a  
‘wicked state] to the primitive state of their  
‘nature.’

He means, they are freed from the guilt of original sin, and in some sense reduced back to the primitive state, in which man was before that happened. He plainly speaks here of infants as baptized ‘in the apostles’ time,’ as well as in his own; and makes St. John (if his meaning be to speak of the persons baptized by him), in baptizing infants for the reformation of their nature back again to

<sup>n</sup> [The edition of Ambrosius which Dr. Wall made use of read *expletum* for *exemplum* in this passage: but the Benedictine editors have corrected the text, on the unanimous authority of their manuscripts.]

CHAP. XIII. the primitive purity of it, to resemble Elias in turning back the waters to their spring head.

<sup>274.</sup>  
(A.D. 374.) This passage of St. Ambrose is quoted by St. Austin, lib. i. contra Julian. c. 2.

I said in the former editions, that St. Ambrose does here say in effect, that John Baptist did baptize infants. My reason was, because he had before, in the parallel between John and Elias, observed, that as Elias was in the desert, so was John: as Elias was fed by ravens, so John lived upon coarse food: as Elias boldly rebuked Ahab, so John did Herod. And (among other comparisons), ‘Ille Jordanem divisit; hic ad lavacrum salutare convertit.’ ‘As Elias separated [or drove back] the waters of Jordan; so John brought persons to the baptism of salvation.’ Which, joined with what he says here, that the new formation of infants in baptism back to their primitive purity, was typified by Jordan turned back toward the spring head, does, I think, lead to such an interpretation of his words. But however (leaving that deduction of the chain of thought to the judgment of the reader) he does plainly speak of the baptism of infants used in the apostles’ time. Which is more to the purpose.

*Ambrosius* lib. ii. *de Abrahamo patriarcha*, lib. ii. c. 11. [§. 81, &c.]

II. He is here speaking of that part of the history of Abraham, where he is commanded to be circumcised, and to circumcise his infants; and of the severity of the penalty on an infant that is not circumcised: and has these words in relation to circumcision; ‘For a very good reason does the law command the males to be circumcised in the beginning of infancy, even the bondslave born in the

‘house: because as circumcision is from infancy, so  
 ‘is the disease. No time ought to be void of the  
 ‘remedy, because none is void of guilt,’ &c. And CHAP.  
XIII.  

---

274.  
(A.D. 374.)  
 a little after, ‘Neither a proselyte that is old, nor  
 ‘an infant born in the house, is excepted; because  
 ‘every age is obnoxious to sin, and therefore every  
 ‘age is proper for the sacrament.’ He also applies  
 this to spiritual circumcision and baptism, and says,  
 ‘The meaning of the mystery is plain. Those born  
 ‘in the house are the Jews, those bought with mo-  
 ‘ney are the Gentiles that believed: for the church  
 ‘is bought with the price of Christ’s blood. There-  
 ‘fore both Jew and Gentile, and all that believe,  
 ‘must learn to circumcise themselves from sin, that  
 ‘they may be saved. Both the home-born and the  
 ‘foreigner, the just and the sinful, must be circum-  
 ‘cised by the forgiveness of sins, so as not to prac-  
 ‘tise sin any more: for no person comes to the  
 ‘kingdom of heaven but by the sacrament of bap-  
 ‘tism:’ and at the end of that paragraph cites these  
 words of our Saviour, giving his note on them:

‘*Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu*  
 ‘*Sancto, non potest introire in regnum Dei.* Utique  
 ‘nullum excipit: non infantem, non aliqua præven-  
 ‘tum necessitate. Habeant tamen illam opertam  
 ‘pœnarum immunitatem, nescio an habeant regni  
 ‘honorem.’ [§. 84.]

‘*For unless any person be born again of water*  
 ‘*and of the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the*  
 ‘*kingdom of God.* You see he excepts no person,  
 ‘not an infant, not one that is hindered by any  
 ‘unavoidable accident.

‘But suppose that such have that freedom from  
 ‘punishment, which is not clear, yet I question



CHAP. 'whether they shall have the honour of the king-  
XIII. 'dom.'

<sup>274.</sup>  
(A.D. 374.) This, as to the need of baptizing infants, is plain: but I know not what to make of the word *opertam* in this sentence, unless it be to be rendered as I have rendered it ['which is not clear,' or, 'of which 'we have no certain knowledge.']

Many writers of the Greek church do speak of a certain middle state in the life to come, in which infants that die unbaptized, and also other persons that miss of baptism, not by their own fault, but by some accidental hinderance, shall be placed; which place or state shall not, as they think, partake, or not much partake, either of happiness or torment. Gregory Nazianzen's words to that purpose are in the passages I cited of his<sup>o</sup>, and I shall have occasion hereafter<sup>p</sup> to mention more. But this opinion of a middle state seems not to have taken any footing in the Latin church at this time; though it be since embraced by the papists, under the name of *limbus puerorum*.

St. Ambrose, who was conversant in the Greek writers, and, as St. Hierome<sup>q</sup> observes, borrowed much out of their works, had met with it there; and here mentions it, but calls it *opertam*, a thing not certainly revealed or known, but hidden and uncertain. His meaning is, that since our Saviour's sentence of the necessity of baptism for entering the kingdom of God is general, and does not except infants; it is very questionable, whether an infant unbaptized can have the said kingdom. And as for the middle state between heaven and hell, which

<sup>o</sup> Ch. 11. §. 6.

<sup>p</sup> Part ii. ch. 6. §. 4.

<sup>q</sup> Præfat. in lib. Didymi. [Op. tom. ii. p. 106.]

some do suppose, it is to us a thing hidden or unknown whether there be any such state. One may observe in this passage, a thing which I have observed in many sayings of the ancients, that among the several names which they give to baptism, they often by this phrase [the forgiveness of sins] do mean the sacrament of baptism. The coherence of the sentence shews it here. ‘They must be circumcised by the forgiveness of sins; for no person can come to the kingdom of heaven but by the sacrament of baptism.’ And so it does in a passage of the epistle of Barnabas which I produce, part ii. ch. 9. §. 6.

CHAP.  
XIII.

274.  
(A.D. 374.)

St. Austin, a little after these times, does earnestly labour to shew that there is no such state, though he had once so spoken as if he thought there might. I shall have occasion to produce his sayings on<sup>r</sup> one side and the other<sup>s</sup>. He is the more earnest at this latter place against the middle state, because Pelagius had served himself of this notion to evade the argument which is taken from the need that infants have of baptism, to prove that they have original sin. For Pelagius said they have no sin: and if they die unbaptized, they will not be punished, but be in that middle state.

The quotations out of the book *de Vocatione Gentium*, and *Epist. ad Demetriadem*<sup>t</sup>, I have not, as many do, set down to St. Ambrose, because they are not his, but Prosper’s or pope Leo’s: who yet lived both of them but a little after our period.

340.  
344.

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xv. sect. 3. §. 1, 2.

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xix. §. 10.

<sup>t</sup> [See the preface of the Benedictine editors, prefixed to the second volume of St. Ambrose’s works.]

CHAP. Every body has read how largely Prosper there dis-  
 XIII. puts against those that would maintain that all the  
 —————  
<sup>274.</sup>  
 (A.D. 374.) grace of God depends upon our use of free-will;  
 shewing that they that use that method of explain-  
 ing the events that happen, can never solve that  
 difficulty, ‘ how it comes to pass that so great a  
 ‘ multitude of infants dying unbaptized [or as he  
 ‘ styles it, unregenerated] do perish.’ On which  
 argument he has a whole chapter, pretending to  
 shew that all must be attributed to God’s free giving  
 or refusing his grace.

---

CHAP. XIV.

*Quotations out of St. John Chrysostom.*

<sup>280.</sup>  
 (A.D. 380.) §. I. St. Chrysostom has had more of his works  
 published than any of the foregoing, because every  
 thing that he preached or dictated was thought fit  
 to be published; not that he had any greater skill  
 in divinity than ordinary, but because of his golden  
 tongue, from which he had this name, and which  
 made the people that used to hear him say, ‘ They  
 ‘ had rather the sun should not shine, than that  
 ‘ John should not preach.’ But of the multitude  
 that were published a great many are lost; and, to  
 make up the defect, a great many spurious ones  
 have been set out under his name. The industry  
 and skill of the latter ages, and particularly of sir  
 Henry Savile<sup>u</sup>, has in a good degree fanned and  
 distinguished the one from the other.

<sup>u</sup> [Sir H. Savile published an edition of Chrysostom’s works,  
 in the original Greek, in 8 volumes folio, at Eton, in 1612.  
 Another, in Greek and Latin, was published at Paris, by Fronto



Therefore I shall omit the quotations about this subject, that are found in those books that are either plainly spurious, or suspected; though they are probably very ancient, and of men that lived at, or about the same time. Of the first sort is the homily concerning Adam and Eve, in which is a passage mentioning infant-baptism; but it is plainly the work of some later author. Of the second is the homily on Psalm xiv. in which is a passage of the same subject, which is quoted in this controversy by many learned men, Cassander, &c., and even by bishop Stillingfleet<sup>x</sup>.

CHAP.  
XIV.

280.  
(A.D. 380.)

As for the passages in his genuine works, he has not many on this subject: for orators love only such subjects as may be adorned with flowers of rhetoric, of which so plain a thing as the baptizing of infants is not so capable; and for those which he has, I am not very confident that I have all that are in so many voluminous books: but those which I shall produce do plainly shew his sense, and the practice of the churches where he lived, which were Antioch and Constantinople.

*Hom. 40. in Genesin, Edit. Savil. tom. i. [Montf. tom. iv.]*

He had been speaking of circumcision, and observes how much more favourable and bountiful God is to the Christians in the baptism which he has appointed to them in lieu thereof; and says,

‘ There was pain and trouble in practice of that, and no other advantage accruing from the circum-

Ducæus, in 12 volumes folio, in 1633—1636. But the most complete is that by the Benedictine father Montfaucon, in 13 volumes folio, published at Paris in 1718, &c.]

<sup>x</sup> Unreasonableness of Separation, part iii. ch. 36.

CHAP.  
XIV.280.  
(A.D. 380.)

‘cision, than this only; that by this sign they were  
 ‘known and distinguished from other nations.’ ‘*Ἡ δὲ  
 ἡμετέρα περιτομή, ἣ τοῦ βαπτίσματος λέγω χάρις, ἀνώ-  
 δινον ἔχει τὴν ἰατρειάν καὶ μυρίων ἀγαθῶν πρόξενος γίνεται  
 ἡμῖν, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡμᾶς ἐμπίπλησι χάριτος. Καὶ  
 οὐδὲ ὠρισμένον ἔχει καιρὸν καθάπερ ἐκεῖ· ἀλλ’ ἔξεστι καὶ  
 ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικία, καὶ ἐν μέσῃ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ γήρῳ γενόμενόν  
 τινα ταύτην δέξασθαι τὴν ἀχειροποίητον περιτομήν· ἐν ᾗ  
 οὐκ ἐστι πόνον ὑπομεῖναι, ἀλλ’ ἀμαρτημάτων φορτία  
 ἀποθέσθαι, καὶ τῶν ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ πλημμελημάτων τὴν  
 συγχώρησιν εὑρέσθαι.* ‘But our circumcision, I mean  
 ‘the grace of baptism, gives cure without pain, and  
 ‘procures to us a thousand benefits, and fills us with  
 ‘the grace of the Spirit: and it has no determinate  
 ‘time, as that had; but one that is in the very  
 ‘beginning of his age, or one that is in the middle  
 ‘of it, or one that is in his old age, may receive this  
 ‘circumcision made without hands. In which there  
 ‘is no trouble to be undergone, but to throw off the  
 ‘load of sins, and receive pardon for all foregoing  
 ‘offences.’ [§. 4.]

That *ἄωρος ἡλικία* signifies here, as I have rendered it, ‘the beginning of age,’ or infancy, appears both by the sense, and also by his use of the same word in the homily before<sup>y</sup>, where giving the reasons why circumcision was appointed the eighth day, he makes this to be one:

1. Because the cutting of the flesh is more easily borne ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικία ‘in the beginning of the age,’ or infancy.

2. And his other reason is, ‘that they might  
 ‘understand by the thing itself that it signified  
 ‘nothing to the soul, but was given for a mark of

<sup>y</sup> Hom. xxxix. in Genesin, [§. 5.]

‘ distinction;’ and then he there again uses the same word, τὸ γὰρ ἄωρον παιδίον, τὸ μὴ γινώσκον τὰ γινόμενα, CHAP.  
XIV.  
μηδὲ αἰσθησὶν τινα ἔχον, &c. ‘ For a *new-born* child, 280.  
(A.D. 380.)  
‘ that knows not what is done to him, nor has any  
‘ sense, what profit for his soul can he receive  
‘ thereby?’ &c. The word ἄωρος, which in some au-  
thors signifies *unseasonable*, or *out of time*, signifies  
with him *newly begun*, or *that has had no time*  
*pass over it*.

It is a very singular notion in divinity of this father, to say that circumcision had no spiritual import, but was only a badge of national distinction. The scripture, and the fathers too, generally speak of it as *the seal of the righteousness of the faith that Abraham had*<sup>z</sup>, and the covenant, or *seal of the covenant*<sup>a</sup> that God made with him and his seed. And that contains something more than that they should be known from other nations. It was, that *he would be their God, and they his people*<sup>b</sup>.

Also to argue, that circumcision could signify nothing to the soul, because it was given ἐν ἁώρῳ ἡλικία, in infancy, at the same place where one is to shew that baptism (which, as he himself grants, may also be given ἐν ἁώρῳ ἡλικία, *in infancy*) does convey so many spiritual benefits, betrays some inadvertency or forgetfulness of what he had said before.

II. But it is more to our present purpose to observe the other difference that he makes: ‘ Circum-  
‘ cision was to be given on the eighth day: but  
‘ baptism has no determinate time, but it is lawful  
‘ that one in infancy, or one in middle age, or one  
‘ in old age, do receive it.’ Was it not the same in  
circumcision? If circumcision had been omitted in

<sup>z</sup> Rom. iv. 11.<sup>a</sup> Acts vii. 11.<sup>b</sup> Gen. xvii. 7.



CHAP. XIV. infancy, or if it were a heathen who came over to the Jewish religion in middle age, or old age, circumcision was given then, rather than not at all.

<sup>280.</sup>  
(A.D. 380.)

Or is his meaning this; that a Jew was obliged to circumcise his child in infancy, but a Christian parent may baptize his child in infancy, if he please; or he may, if he please, let it alone to be done at middle, or at old age? His words, as they stand here, might be capable of such a sense; but this is not reconcilable with what he says in other places of the necessity of baptism, and the danger in case a person die without it, which would often happen to children, if it were so deferred. He often speaks to this purpose, as Hom. 1. *de pœnitentia*<sup>c</sup>: Πρὸ δὲ βαπτίσματος οὐκ ἐστὶ πατρῶα λαβεῖν, οὐδὲ δέξασθαι κληρονομίαν. And again, Οὐδεὶς δὲ υἱὸς βαπτίσματος ἂν κληθείη χωρίς. ‘There is no receiving or having ‘the bequeathed inheritance before one is baptized;’ and, ‘none can be called a son till he is ‘baptized.’ And I have occasion to quote more of his to this purpose at another place<sup>d</sup>. St. Austin quotes a saying of his to this purpose in his disputes with Julian<sup>e</sup> (if he do not mistake an oration of St. Basil’s for one of St. Chrysostom’s; for the words are the same which I recited of St. Basil’s). St. Austin is there proving that Chrysostom, as well as the other catholic doctors, owned original sin; which Julian denied, though he owned infant baptism.

‘The same holy John, even he as well as the ‘martyr Cyprian, teaches that the circumcision of ‘the flesh was commanded in way of a type of ‘baptism.’ Then he recites these words, as from

<sup>c</sup> [Sect. 4. Op. tom. ii. p. 285.]

<sup>d</sup> Part ii. ch. 6.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. ii. contra Julianum, cap. ix.

Chrysostom: 'A Jew does not delay circumcision because of the threatening,' &c. 'and dost thou delay the circumcision made without hands, &c.' as they stand recited above<sup>f</sup>. Then St. Austin adds, 'You see how this man established in the ecclesiastical doctrine compares circumcision to circumcision, and threat to threat: that which it is *not to be circumcised on the eighth day*; that it is *not to be baptized in Christ*: and what it is *to be cut off from his people*; that it is *not to enter into the kingdom of heaven*. And yet you [Pelagians] say that in the baptism of infants there is no putting off the flesh, i. e. no circumcision made without hands; when you affirm that they have nothing which needs to be put off: for you do not confess them to be *dead in the uncircumcision of the flesh*<sup>g</sup>, by which is meant *sin*, especially that sin which is derived originally: for by reason of this, our body is the *body of sin*<sup>h</sup>, which the apostle says *is destroyed by the cross of Christ*.'

CHAP.  
XIV.

280.  
(A.D. 380.)

III. There is another passage in a homily of St. Chrysostom *ad Baptizatos*, which is not now extant in Greek, but is cited by Julian in Latin, and by St. Austin in Greek, which is full to this purpose of infant-baptism. The citations are in St. Austin's lib. i. *contra Julianum*<sup>i</sup>; where Julian says thus:

'Holy John, bishop of Constantinople, denies that there is any original sin in infants; for in that homily which he preached concerning baptized persons he says,

' "Blessed be God, who only does wonders, who

<sup>f</sup> Ch. xii. §. 5.

<sup>g</sup> Col. ii. 13.

<sup>h</sup> Rom. vi. 6.

<sup>i</sup> [Cap. vi. §. 21. apud Augustini Opera, tom. x. p. 509. edit. Benedictin.]

CHAP.  
XIV.

<sup>280.</sup>  
(A.D. 380.)

‘ has created and ordered all things : lo ! they do  
‘ enjoy the serenity of freedom, who but even now  
‘ were held in captivity : they are become citizens  
‘ of the church, who were in the vagabond state of  
‘ aliens ; and they are entered into the lot of the  
‘ righteous, who were under the confusion of sin.  
‘ For they are not only free, but saints ; nor saints  
‘ only, but justified ; and not only justified, but  
‘ sons ; and not only sons, but heirs ; not heirs only,  
‘ but brothers of Christ ; not only his brethren, but  
‘ coheirs ; not coheirs only, but members of him ;  
‘ not members only, but his temple ; and not his  
‘ temple only, but organs of his Spirit. You see  
‘ how many are the benefits of baptism. And yet  
‘ some think that the heavenly grace consists only  
‘ in forgiveness of sins : but I have reckoned up ten  
‘ advantages of it. For this cause we baptize in-  
‘ fants also, though they are not defiled with sin ;  
‘ that there may be superadded to them saintship,  
‘ righteousness, adoption, inheritance, a brotherhood  
‘ with Christ, and to be made members of him.”’

IV. This sentence Julian brought to shew that Chrysostom’s sense was, that infants are baptized, not for forgiveness of sins, from which they are free, but only that they might have a right to Christ’s kingdom ; which was exactly what Julian and his party, who denied original sin, would have.

And indeed it was a shrewd place ; and St. Austin has much ado to reconcile it to any good and catholic sense : he uses three ways to do it.

1. He shews how improbable it was that John, living in the catholic church, and being a renowned bishop in it, should really hold a doctrine so con-



trary to that which he had shewn by instances to be the general sense of all catholic doctors.

CHAP.  
XIV.

2. He produces other passages out of his writings, which do plainly own the orthodox doctrine of the guilt of original sin, however incongruously he may seem to speak in this place.

280.  
(A.D. 380.)

3. As to the place itself, he shews that Julian had not translated the words exactly true, but had given the expression a turn to his own advantage: for whereas the words are in the Greek, ‘though they have not any sins,’ Julian had made use of a faulty Latin translation, in which some copies read, ‘not defiled with sins,’ others, ‘with sin,’ in the singular number. Of which last copy St. Austin says, ‘I doubt some of your party have chosen to express it in the singular number, that it might be taken for that *one sin*, of which the apostle speaks; *judgment came by one [sin] to condemnation; but the free gift is of many offences unto justification*.’—You choose to word it, “not defiled with sin,” that that *one sin* of the first man might come into the reader’s mind.

‘But not to go by suspicions, and supposing this to be the mistake of the scribe, or the variety of the interpreter, I will set down the Greek words themselves which John spoke; *Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ παῖδια βάπτίζομεν, καίτοι ἁμαρτήματα οὐκ ἔχοντα*. Which is, “For this reason we baptize infants also, though they have not any sins.” You see, he did not say that infants are not defiled with sin, or sins; but, that they have not any sins. Understand it, *of their own*, and there is no dispute. But you will say, Why did he not say, *of their own*? Why do

CHAP. XIV. 'you think, but for this reason, because he, dis-  
 280.  
 (A.D. 380.) 'coursing in the catholic church, supposed that he  
 'could be understood in no other sense; nobody  
 'was puzzled about that matter. You [Pelagians]  
 'not having then raised any controversy, he spoke  
 'with less caution.' [§. 22.]

Perhaps there might have been added to St. Au-  
 stin's answer this; that the Greek writers, though  
 they own this natural corruption, yet do not gene-  
 rally by the property of their language call it by  
 the name of *sin*; but they express it by the name  
*natural defilement*, pollution, disease, and the like,  
 that which the Latins call *original sin*. The word  
*ἀμαρτία*, and especially *ἀμαρτήμα*, do properly with  
 them signify an *actual* sin or transgression. So  
 320. Theodoret, who lived a little after these times, and  
 consequently ought to speak with more caution, and  
 was no favourer of Pelagianism, (for that was a time  
 when Pelagius and his opinions having been lately  
 condemned by canons and edicts in all parts of the  
 world, it was no time for a bishop of the catholic  
 church to own them,) yet speaks thus; 'Baptism is  
 'not, (as the silly Messalians say,) a razor only to  
 'cut off sins that are past, which it does over and  
 'above. For if it had no other effect but that,  
 'what need we baptize infants, that have not tasted  
 'of sin? The sacrament promises not this only, but  
 'greater and higher things; for it is a pledge of  
 'future blessings, a type of the resurrection, a com-  
 'munication of Christ's passion<sup>k</sup>,' &c.

And this is made more plain by the phrase used  
 by Isidorus Pelusiota (who as well as Theodoret

<sup>k</sup> Hæretic. Fabular. lib. v. c. de Baptismo. [cap. 18. tom. iv.  
 p. 292. edit. Paris. 1642.]

was a disciple of St. Chrysostom, and both of them CHAP. XIV.  
 followers of his doctrine, and imitators, as far as  
 they could, of his expression). For he, at the same <sup>280.</sup>  
 place, speaks of infants as not having any sin, and (A.D. 380.)  
 yet being defiled with the corruption caused by  
 Adam's transgression. His words are,

‘Whereas your excellency wrote to me, desiring  
 ‘to know for what reason τὰ βρέφη ἀναμάρτητα ὄντα  
 ‘βαπτίζονται, infants that have no sin are baptized:  
 ‘I have thought it needful to give you my answer.  
 ‘Some, that speak below the dignity of the subject,  
 ‘say it is, that they may wash off that pollution,  
 ‘ρύπον, which is transmitted on human nature, by  
 ‘the transgression of Adam. I also do believe that  
 ‘that is done; but not that only, (for that were not  
 ‘so great a matter,) but that a great many other  
 ‘graces far transcending our nature are thereby  
 ‘given<sup>1</sup>.’ And so he goes on to reckon up redemp-  
 tion, regeneration, adoption, &c., much to the same  
 purpose as St. Chrysostom does.

This shews that in their way of speaking, infants,  
 though acknowledged to have a pollution of nature  
 from Adam which needed washing off, yet were  
 said not to have ἀμαρτίας or ἀμαρτήματα, sins. And  
 even those commendations of baptism, and the ef-  
 fects of it in infants, that it is redemption, regene-  
 ration, &c., do suppose an evil state from which they  
 are redeemed, regenerated, &c., which state is the  
 same that the Latins call *original sin*.

But be that how it will; St. Chrysostom speaks  
 plainly of the practice of infant-baptism. And our  
 present inquiry is to know the practice of the

<sup>1</sup> Lib. iii. Epist. 195. ad Herminum Comitem. [p. 333, edit.  
 Paris. 1638.]



CHAP.  
XIV.

<sup>280.</sup>  
(A.D. 380.)

churches, and not whether he had a right apprehension of all the grounds of it. If any in these times used it, and did not well apprehend the grounds of it, it is the greater sign that they were satisfied that it had ever been done.

*Chrysost. Hom. 23. in Acta Apost.* [Tom. ix. ed. Montf.]

V. He is there bemoaning that evil inclination, and that aversion to a godly life, that is universally found in men; which keeps from receiving of baptism those that are not yet baptized, and perverts from a godly course of life even those that have received it. And on that head says thus; Οἱ μὲν οὖν κατηχούμενοι τοῦτο σπουδάζοντες οὐδεμίαν ποιοῦνται ἐπιμέλειαν ὀρθοῦ βίου. Οἱ δὲ ἤδη φωτισθέντες, οἱ μὲν ἐπεὶ παῖδες ὄντες τοῦτο ἔλαβον, οἱ δὲ ἐν ἀρρώστίᾳ, καὶ ἀνεγκώντες, ἐπειδὴ μὴ εἶχον προθυμίαν τινὰ ζῆσαι διὰ Θεόν, οὐδὲ οὗτοι σπουδὴν τίθενται. Οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑγιείᾳ λαβόντες, ὀλίγην ταύτην καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπιδείκνυνται, καὶ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν διατεθέντες θερμοὶ, μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ οὗτοι τὸ πῦρ ἔσβεσαν. ‘The catechumens being of this mind, [i. e. having ‘this aversion,] take no care of a godly life. And ‘those that are baptized, some of them, forasmuch as ‘they were children when they received it, and some, ‘for that they received it in a fit of sickness, having ‘put it off to that time, and having no mind to live ‘godly, shew no good inclination. And they that ‘received it in their health shew but very little: having ‘been for the present zealously affected, afterward ‘even they let this fire of zeal go out.’ [§. 3. p. 189.]

Here it plainly appears, that part of the people he speaks to (viz. those that had been born of Christian baptized parents) had been baptized in infancy: and part of them (viz. those that had turned

Christians in their adult age) had been baptized since : and some of the last sort were not yet baptized.

CHAP.  
XIV.

280.  
(A.D. 380.)

VI. Another passage of St. Chrysostom does not mention baptism by name ; but yet it plainly refers to the custom of making on the infant's forehead the sign of the cross at his baptism. It is this ;

*Hom. 12. in 1 Epist. ad Corinthios* <sup>m</sup>.

He is there blaming the women for several superstitious and heathenish rites which they practised upon their new-born infants ; one was, a custom that they had of rubbing the forehead of the child with a sort of dirt, prepared with some magical tricks, which was to preserve it from being bewitched. He tells them that such a practice, instead of guarding and purifying the infant, makes it abominable : the words are,

‘Ο βορβόρω χρίων πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ βδελυκτὸν ποιεῖ τὸ παιδίον ; πῶς γὰρ αὐτὸ προσάγει ταῖς χερσὶ τοῦ ἱερέως, εἰπέ μοι ; πῶς ἀξιοῖς ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου σφραγίδα ἐπιτεθῆναι παρὰ τῆς τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου χειρὸς, ἔνθα τὸν βόρβορον ἐπέχρισας ;

‘ He that anoints an infant so with that dirt, how  
‘ can he think but that he makes it abominable ?  
‘ How can he bring it to the hands of the priest ?  
‘ Tell me, how can you think it fitting for the  
‘ minister to make the sign on its forehead, where  
‘ you have besmeared it with the dirt ?’

<sup>m</sup> Prope finem. [§. 7. tom. x. p. 108.]

## CHAP. XV.

*Quotations out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, before the Rise of the Pelagian controversy.*

## §. 1. Out of St. Hierome's Letter to Leta.

CHAP. XV. 278—310.  
(A.D.  
378—410.) THERE was never nigh so much occasion given to mention the baptism of infants in books and writings, before Pelagius vented his heresy against the doctrine of original sin, as there was after that heresy was started: for as the disputes about that matter filled all the world, so the arguments which the catholics drew from the baptism of infants for original sin, and the Pelagians' answer to them, made a considerable part of those disputes.

These two fathers lived to see, and to bear a great part of the said disputes; but they had each of them written several books before that controversy began. The quotations out of their tracts against the Pelagians will be best understood if put in a chapter by themselves, together with some others out of Pelagius himself, and other managers of the same party, and ranked according to the order of time in which they were written; for they were mostly written by way of impleading and answering one another. I have therefore in this chapter selected some passages out of such writings of theirs as were before the said controversy, or did not at all relate to it: that the mixing of them may not disturb the order of the other.

*Hieronymus, Epist. ad Letam de Institutione filiaë; Epist. 7. [Epist. 107. Op. tom. i. p. 671. edit. Vallarsii.]*

He is there admonishing that lady of the charge that lay on her conscience to take care of the



education of her child, and that God does require of CHAP.  
 parents an account of the child's miscarriage, if it XV.  
 happen by their fault; and says,

278—310.  
 (A.D.

‘ Eli the priest brought on himself the anger of 378—410.)  
 ‘ God for the faults of his children. He must not be  
 ‘ a bishop that has children riotous or unruly. On  
 ‘ the other side it is written of a woman, that *she*  
 ‘ *shall be saved in [or by] the procreating of children,*  
 ‘ *if they shall continue in faith, and charity, and holi-*  
 ‘ *ness with modesty*<sup>n</sup>. If their adult age, when they  
 ‘ are at their own dispose, be imputed to their parents;  
 ‘ how much more the time of their infancy and tender  
 ‘ years, which, as the scripture says, is not able to  
 ‘ distinguish the right hand from the left, i. e. knows  
 ‘ not the difference of good and evil?’ Then follows  
 this objection :

‘ Et quomodo, inquires, peccata patrum filiis non  
 ‘ redduntur, nec filiorum parentibus, sed *anima quæ*  
 ‘ *peccaverit, ipsa morietur?*

‘ Hoc de his dicitur qui possunt sapere, de quibus  
 ‘ in Evangelio scriptum est; *Ætatem habet, loquatur*  
 ‘ *pro se*. Qui autem parvulus est et sapit ut parvulus,  
 ‘ donec ad annos sapientiæ veniat, et Pythagoræ litera  
 ‘ (Y) eum perducatur ad bivium; tam bona ejus quam  
 ‘ mala parentibus imputantur. Nisi forte æstimas  
 ‘ Christianorum filios, si baptisma non acceperint,  
 ‘ ipsos tantum reos esse peccati; et non etiam scelus  
 ‘ referri ad eos qui dare noluerint: maxime eo tem-  
 ‘ pore quo contradicere non poterant qui accepturi  
 ‘ erant. Sicut e regione [alias, sic in regione vitæ<sup>o</sup>]  
 ‘ salus infantium majorum lucrum est.’ [§. 5.]

<sup>n</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 15.

<sup>o</sup> [Vallarsius' edition does not take notice of this various reading.]

CHAP. ' And how then is it true, you will say, that the  
 XV. ' sins of the fathers are not imputed to the children,  
 278—310. ' nor those of the children to the fathers, but the  
 (A.D. ' soul that sinneth, it shall die?'  
 378—410.)

' This is said of those that have understanding;  
 ' of such as he was, of whom it is written in the  
 ' gospel, *He is of age, let him speak for himself*. But  
 ' he that is a child, and thinks as a child, (till such  
 ' time as he comes to years of discretion, and  
 ' Pythagoras' letter (Y) do bring him to the place  
 ' where the road parts into two,) his good deeds, as  
 ' well as his evil deeds, are imputed to his parents.  
 ' Unless you will think that the children of Chris-  
 ' tians are themselves only under the guilt of the  
 ' sin, if they do not receive baptism: and that the  
 ' wickedness is not imputed to those also who would  
 ' not give it them; especially at that time when they  
 ' that were to receive it could make no opposition  
 ' against the receiving it. As also on the other side  
 ' [or, as also in the kingdom of life] the salvation  
 ' of infants is the advantage of their parents.'

Though St. Hierome calls himself an old man in one part of this epistle; yet it was written a great while (thirty years at least) before his death, and consequently twenty years before Pelagius vented his new opinion. For he speaks here of Eustochium, who was this lady's husband's sister, as a young girl; and yet his epistle to the said *Eustochium, de virginitate servanda*<sup>p</sup>, was written thirty years before his epistle to Demetrias on the same subject, as he himself observes in the latter.

His mentioning how great a sin it would be in Christian parents to neglect the baptizing of their

<sup>p</sup> [Epist. xxii. tom. i. p. 87.]

infants, renders that improbable (which yet some learned men of late have supposed to be true) that his own parents (who, as it seems, were Christians) had neglected the baptizing him in infancy: and that he was not baptized till he came to Rome. Of which opinion, and the mistake on which it is grounded, I must say something, as also of some other such instances, in a chapter on that subject<sup>q</sup>.

CHAP.  
XV.  
<sup>278.</sup>  
(A.D. 378.)

§. 2. Out of St. Austin's book *De Sermone Domini in Monte*.

St. Austin was a man of note in the church, and continued writing of books for forty years and more. There never was any one man whose pains were so successful in healing the wounds of the church, caused by schisms and heresies. His moderate and popular way of arguing had a great effect. Besides his writing against the Manichees, of whom he had been one, and some Arians that were then yet left; he had a main hand in reducing the Donatists, and confuting the Pelagians. These latter began but twenty years before he died, viz. anno Dom. 410.<sup>310.</sup> and he had wrote several books before they appeared. The quotations that I shall produce at present are out of those former books. One is that which I briefly mentioned before<sup>r</sup>, viz. in his

Lib. i. *de Sermone Domini in Monte*, c. 27. [cap. xvi. §. 45. tom. iii. p. 185. ed. Benedict.]

He being there to explain that part of our Saviour's sermon which forbids divorce, takes occasion to cite that advice of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 12. that a Christian should not put away his wife, though she as yet continued in heathenism or unbelief: and

<sup>q</sup> Part ii. ch. 3.

<sup>r</sup> Ch. 4. and II.



CHAP. repeats the words that follow in the text, and gives  
XV. his paraphrase upon them thus :

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.) ‘ *Sanctificatus est enim, inquit, vir infidelis in*  
*uxore [fidei]; et sanctificata est mulier infidelis*  
*in fratre [fidei]<sup>s</sup>.’*

‘ Credo jam provenerat ut nonnullæ fœminæ per  
‘ viros fideles, et viri per uxores fideles in fidem ve-  
‘ nirent : et quāvis non dicens nomina, exemplis  
‘ tamen hortatus est ad confirmandum consilium  
‘ suum. Deinde sequitur :

‘ *Alioquin filii vestri immundi essent, nunc autem*  
*sancti sunt.*

‘ Jam enim erant parvuli Christiani, qui sive au-  
‘ thore uno ex parentibus, sive utroque consentiente  
‘ sanctificati erant : quod non fieret si uno credente  
‘ dissociaretur conjugium, et non toleraretur infide-  
‘ litas conjugis usque ad opportunitatem credendi<sup>t</sup>.

‘ *For, says he, an unbelieving husband has been*  
*sanctified by his believing wife, and an unbeliev-*  
*ing wife by her believing husband.*

‘ I suppose it had then happened that several  
‘ wives had been brought to the faith by their be-  
‘ lieving husbands, and husbands by their believing  
‘ wives. And though he does not mention their  
‘ names, yet he makes use of their example to con-  
‘ firm his advice. Then it follows,

‘ *Else were your children unclean ; but now are*  
*they holy.*

‘ For there were then Christian infants that were  
‘ sanctified [or made holy, i. e. that were baptized]

<sup>s</sup> [The Benedictine editors omit the word *fidei* in both cases, as being wanting in the manuscripts, and also forming no part of St. Paul’s remark.]

<sup>t</sup> 1 Cor. vii. 14.

‘ some by the authority of one of their parents, some  
 ‘ by the consent of both : which would not be, if as CHAP.  
XV.  
 ‘ soon as one party believed, the marriage were dis- 288.  
(A.D. 388.)  
 ‘ solved, and the infidelity of the parties were not  
 ‘ borne with till there were an opportunity of be-  
 ‘ lieving.’

Here we see St. Austin’s sense of that expression of St. Paul, which has been of late the subject of so much debate. He judges St. Paul’s meaning to be this : it is advisable for a Christian husband, whose wife will not as yet own the faith of Christ, not to put her away ; because it is probable that he may in time gain her to the true religion : such examples are by God’s grace very frequent. You commonly see the unbelieving party sanctified, or brought to faith and baptism, by the believing one. Were it not so, that the faith of the one did generally prevail against the infidelity of the other ; the children of such would be generally left in their unclean state, and be brought up to heathenism : whereas we see now on the contrary, that those of you that live in a state of marriage with unbelievers, do generally so far prevail by God’s grace, that your children are made holy, or sanctified and dedicated to the true God by baptism.

If this explication do seem remote to us now ; it is because we do not, so frequently as they did, use the word *sanctification* and *sanctified* for baptism and baptized. I believe it is not so little as a hundred times, that St. Austin for one, when he is to speak of infants or other persons baptized or to be baptized, expresses it *sanctified*, as we see he does here. If the reader pleases, he may turn back to ch. xi. §. 9. where there is more said of that matter.

CHAP. And by what I shall produce hereafter<sup>u</sup>, it will  
 XV. appear that most of the ancients understood this text

<sup>288.</sup>  
 (A.D. 388.) as St. Austin does.

Sect. 3. Out of St. Austin's books of Freewill.

*Augustinus de Libero Arbitrio*, lib. iii. cap. 23.

I. This treatise St. Austin wrote when he was a young man<sup>x</sup>, against the Manichees, who maintain, that as there is one eternal Principle or God that made the soul and all good things, so there is another that has created the body, and is the author of all wickedness, and other evils and calamities; and that one of these comes from a necessary principle as well as the other.

St. Austin shews that God created man with a freewill: and that all sin comes from the ill use of that freewill: and that all other evils are punishments for sin: and that every one shall be judged according as he has either used that freedom of will to good or abused it to evil: and then adds,

‘ Some ignorant people make a slanderous objection against this doctrine, on account of infants dying, and of the bodily pains we often see them suffer: for they say, “To what purpose was such an one born, since he died before he merited any thing? Or what place shall he have in the future judgment, who cannot be among the righteous because he never did any good, nor among the wicked, since he never sinned?” To which we answer, That in the constitution of the universe, and the fit connexion of all the creation in its places and times, no human person can have been created without reason, where not so much as the leaf of a tree is superfluously made. But that that is a

<sup>u</sup> Chap. 19. §. 19.

<sup>x</sup> Aug. Retractat. lib. i. cap. 9.



‘ superfluous question which they put of the merits of  
 ‘ one that never merited any thing : for they need  
 ‘ not fear that it should so happen, that there can  
 ‘ be a life in a middle state between good and bad,  
 ‘ and not a sentence of the judge in a middle way  
 ‘ between reward and punishment.

C H A P.  
 XV.  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.)

‘ Quo loco etiam illud perscrutari homines solent,  
 { ‘ sacramentum baptismi Christi quid parvulis prosit ;  
 ‘ cum eo accepto plerumque moriuntur priusquam ex  
 ‘ eo quidquam cognoscere potuerint. Qua in re satis  
 + } ‘ pie recteque creditur prodesse parvulo eorum fidem  
 ‘ a quibus consecrandus offertur. Et hoc ecclesiæ  
 ‘ commendat saluberrima auctoritas, ut ex eo quisque  
 ‘ sentiat quid sibi prosit fides sua, quando in aliorum  
 ‘ quoque beneficium, qui propriam nondum habent,  
 ‘ potest aliena commodari. Quid enim filio viduæ  
 ‘ profuit fides sua, quam utique mortuus non habe-  
 ‘ bat ? Cui tamen profuit matris, ut resurgeret.’  
 [§. 67. tom. i. p. 637.]

On which head men are wont to ask this ques-  
 tion also : ‘ What good the sacrament of Christ’s  
 ‘ baptism does to infants ? Whereas, after they  
 ‘ have received it, they often die before they are  
 ‘ able to understand any thing of it. As to which  
 ‘ matter it/ is piously and truly believed, that the  
 ‘ faith of those by whom the child is offered to be  
 ‘ consecrated, profits the child. And this the most  
 ‘ sound authority of the church does commend, that  
 ‘ hence every one may judge how profitable his own  
 ‘ faith will be to himself, when even another person’s  
 ‘ faith is useful for the advantage of those that  
 ‘ have as yet none of their own. For how could the  
 ‘ widow’s son<sup>y</sup> be holpen by his own faith, whereof

CHAP. XV. 'being dead he could have none? and yet his mother's faith was useful for his being raised to life again.'

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

328

II. About forty years after the writing of this book (when Pelagianism had in the mean time arisen and sunk again), some Semipelagians in France, who held still that opinion of Pelagius, that infants, dying unbaptized, shall, though they miss of the kingdom of heaven, yet live eternally without punishment, made use of these words of St. Austin to uphold their tenet; as if he had therein expressed himself in favour of the opinion of such a middle state.

Of this, and of other their objections, one Hilary gives him notice by letter. 'They plead,' says he, 'that the case of infants is not to be made an example for that of grown persons. And even as to the case of infants; they say your holiness so spoke of it as if you would have it counted an uncertain thing whether there be any punishment for them; and the negative to be more probable. And you may remember that in your third book concerning freewill your words are such as might give them this occasion<sup>z</sup>.'

But St. Austin in answer<sup>a</sup> shews that they mistook what he spoke hypothetically, and *ad hominem* against the Manichees, for a positive speech. 'Suppose,' says he, 'that at that time when I began my books of freewill, being then but a layman at Rome, or when I made an end of them, being then

<sup>z</sup> Epistola libro de Prædestinatione Sanctorum præfixa, [Op. tom. x. p. 783.]

<sup>a</sup> Lib. de Dono Perseverantiæ; cap. 12. [§. 30. Op. tom. x. p. 836.]

‘ but a presbyter in Africa, I had been unresolved  
 ‘ of that point, that infants not regenerated are  
 ‘ under condemnation, and that those that are rege-  
 ‘ nerated are thereby freed from it :—I hope there is  
 ‘ no man so unjust or envious as to be against my  
 ‘ learning better.

CHAP.  
 XV.  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.)

‘ But whereas the truth is, that I ought not  
 ‘ therefore to be thought to make any question of  
 ‘ that matter, because I judged it fit to confute those  
 ‘ against whom I disputed, in such a manner, that  
 ‘ whether there be any punishment for original sin  
 ‘ in infants, as the truth is; or there be not, as  
 ‘ some mistaken people think: yet still that mix-  
 ‘ ture of the natures of good and evil, which the  
 ‘ Manichees fondly maintain, would have no reason  
 ‘ to be believed. God forbid that I should leave  
 ‘ the matter of infants so, as to say it is uncertain  
 ‘ whether those that are regenerated in Christ, if  
 ‘ they die in infancy, do come to eternal salvation;  
 ‘ and those who are not regenerated do fall into the  
 ‘ second death. Whereas that which is written, *By*  
 ‘ *one man sin entered into the world, and death by*  
 ‘ *sin, and so it passed upon all mankind*<sup>b</sup>, can no  
 ‘ otherwise be understood.’

This answer which he gives to the reflections which the Semipelagians made upon these his first writings may serve now for an answer to that which Grotius has reflected on them in like manner: he says, ‘ That St. Austin, before he was heated with  
 ‘ the Pelagian disputes, never wrote any thing of  
 ‘ the condemnation of unbaptized infants, not even  
 ‘ to those lesser pains in the world to come<sup>c</sup>:’ intimating that he was not of that opinion before. But

<sup>b</sup> Rom. v. 12.

<sup>c</sup> Annot. in Matth. xix. 14.



CHAP. XV. supposing that were true, that he did not in his former writings mention that matter; yet if we may believe him for his own sense, it was not but that he understood the thing to be so at the time of writing this book: but he had not the same occasion to speak of it that he had afterward.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

This he more plainly expresses in a letter<sup>d</sup> to St. Hierome, written in the heat of the Pelagian controversy; where, having made mention of this book and this place, he says, ‘for in that book I did ‘make answer concerning the baptism of infants, ‘*non sufficienter, sed quantum illi operi satis videbatur*; not handling it fully, but as far as was ‘needful in that work; that it does profit even ‘those that are not sensible of it, and have as yet ‘no faith of their own. But I thought it not needful at that time to say any thing concerning the ‘condemnation of those infants that depart this life ‘without it: *Quia non quod nunc agitur agebatur*: ‘Because there was none of that dispute raised then, ‘which is now.’

But I shall by and by<sup>e</sup> have occasion to shew that in other pieces written before the Pelagian times, he speaks of their condemnation.

Sect. 4. Out of St. Austin’s books against the Donatists.

*Augustinus de Baptismo contra Donatistas*, lib. iv. cap. 15.

<sup>300.</sup> §. 1. St. Austin wrote this treatise and many others, against the Donatists; a party of Christians in Africa, who had made a schism from the church sometime before he was born, on the account of one

<sup>d</sup> Epist. 28, [166 in edit. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 583.]

<sup>e</sup> Sect. 5. §. 6.

Cæcilian a bishop; who, as they said, had in times of persecution, under the heathen emperors, denied his religion by giving up the Bible to be burnt; and yet afterward was suffered to continue and do the office of a bishop in the church. CHAP.  
XV.  

---

288.  
(A.D. 388.)

Cæcilian denied the matter of fact, and it could not be plainly proved: but these men were so peremptory and so fierce against him, as not only to renounce him, but also to renounce the communion of the church, which suffered him to continue among them in his office. And it came to such a height, that in St. Austin's time, their party, which was very numerous, did so abhor the settled church, that if any one who had been baptized in the church came over to them, they told him the baptism which he had received in so impure and defiled a church, and from the hands of such wicked men, was null and void; and so they baptized him anew. The church did not so with them; but if any that had been baptized by them came over to the church, he was received as one whose baptism was valid, though given by schismatics.

St. Austin manages thus: he shews the want of proof of the accusation, by producing the acts of court and records by which Cæcilian had been acquitted. But besides, shews that, suppose it were true, one is not to forsake a church because of one or more wicked men that are suffered in it. And particularly in this treatise sets forth the impiety of their practice in rebaptizing. He shews that baptism once given in the right form, viz. in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is valid; how heretical or impure soever the church be in which, or how wicked soever the man be from whose hands

CHAP.  
XV.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

he receives it. [One may here note by the by, that this rule of St. Austin does, by the consent of most ancients, hold good, except in the case of the Paulianists, who seem to have kept the words of the form, (though St. Austin had been informed otherwise,) and yet their opinion concerning Christ was so abhorred by the Christians, that the council of Nice ordered them to be rebaptized, as I shall shew hereafter<sup>f</sup>.] He shews that the baptism is Christ's and not the minister's. And the validity thereof depends on God's authority, not on the goodness or sincerity of the person that officiates. And consequently that those who had been baptized by Cæcilian, or any other wicked bishop, were to be accounted to have their baptism valid: and the priests ordained by him were capable of giving baptism to others.

II. He goes on to shew by the example of Simon Magus, that baptism received with a wicked heart and purpose, (which is a worse circumstance,) is yet valid: and that such a man is to repent of his wickedness, but not to be baptized again. And if a man that is baptized in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, have at that time some unsound opinion concerning the Trinity or any person thereof; he is to reform his opinion, but not to renew his baptism.

And he proves this by the example of those who are baptized young, when they have but an uncouth sense; or infants, when they have no sense at all, of the articles of faith in these words:

‘ Unde multi post baptismum proficientes, et maxime qui infantes, vel pueri baptizati sunt, quanto magis intellectus eorum serenatur et illuminatur,

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. ch. 5. §. 7.



‘ dum interior homo renovatur de die in diem, pri- CHAP.  
 ‘ ores suas opiniones quas de Deo habebant, cum XV.  
 ‘ suis phantasmatis ludificarentur, irridentes et <sup>288.</sup>  
 ‘ detestantes atque confitentes adjiciunt. Nec tamen (A.D. 388.)  
 ‘ ideo non accepisse baptismum existimantur, aut  
 ‘ talem baptismum accepisse dicuntur, qualis fuit  
 ‘ error ipsorum. Sed in eis et sacramenti integritas  
 ‘ honoratur, et mentis vanitas emendatur.’ [§. 22.]

‘ So that many persons increasing in knowledge  
 ‘ after their baptism, and especially those who  
 ‘ have been baptized either when they were infants,  
 ‘ or when they were youths; as their understand-  
 ‘ ing is cleared and enlightened, and their inward  
 ‘ man renewed day by day, do themselves deride,  
 ‘ and with abhorrence and confession renounce the  
 ‘ former opinions which they had of God, when they  
 ‘ were imposed on by their own imaginations. And  
 ‘ yet they are not therefore accounted either not to  
 ‘ have received baptism or to have received a bap-  
 ‘ tism of that nature that their error was. But in  
 ‘ their case both the validity of the sacrament is ac-  
 ‘ knowledged, and the vanity of their understanding  
 ‘ rectified.’

III. And a little after, ch. 23, he having had oc-  
 casion to speak of the penitent thief, who obtained  
 salvation without baptism, shews that that is no  
 more an argument against the necessity of baptism,  
 where it may be had, than the example of baptized  
 infants obtaining salvation without faith is an ar-  
 gument against the necessity of faith, where the  
 subject is capable of it. But that it is an argument  
 that one of these may be without the other; and so  
 that heretics, who neither have nor do teach the  
 right faith, yet may give true baptism, (if they give

CHAP. it in the right form,) which ought not to be reite-  
 XV. rated when the party comes to the true faith.

<sup>288.</sup>  
 (A.D. 388.) For that was one thing with which the Donatists  
 upbraided the catholics, that they received heretics  
 that came over to them, without giving them a new  
 baptism.

He concludes this fourth book with these words :

‘ Sicut autem in latrone, quia per necessitatem cor-  
 ‘ poraliter defuit [baptismus], perfecta salus est ; quia  
 ‘ per pietatem spiritaliter adfuit : sic et cum ipsa præ-  
 ‘ sto est, si per necessitatem desit quod latroni adfuit,  
 ‘ perficitur salus. Quod traditum tenet universitas  
 ‘ ecclesiæ, cum parvuli infantes baptizantur ; qui  
 ‘ certe nondum possunt corde credere ad justitiam,  
 ‘ et ore confiteri ad salutem, quod latro potuit : quin  
 ‘ etiam flendo et vagiendo cum in eis mysterium ce-  
 ‘ lebratur, ipsis mysticis vocibus obstrepunt. Et ta-  
 ‘ men nullus Christianorum dixerit eos inaniter bap-  
 ‘ tizari [cap. xxiii. §. 30.]

‘ Et si quisquam in hac re auctoritatem divinam  
 ‘ quærat : quanquam quod universa tenet ecclesia,  
 ‘ nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est,  
 ‘ non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectissime  
 ‘ creditur : tamen veraciter conjicere possumus, quid  
 ‘ valeat in parvulis baptismi sacramentum, ex cir-  
 ‘ cumcisione carnis, quam prior populus accepit.  
 ‘ Quam priusquam acciperet, justificatus est Abra-  
 ‘ ham. Sicut Cornelius etiam dono Spiritus Sancti,  
 ‘ priusquam baptizaretur, ditatus est : dicit tamen  
 ‘ apostolus de ipso Abraham ; *signum accepit cir-*  
 ‘ *cumcisionis, signaculum fidei justitiæ*, qui jam corde  
 ‘ crediderat, *et deputatum illi erat ad justitiam*.  
 ‘ Cur ergo ei præceptum est, ut omnem dein-  
 ‘ ceps infantem masculum octavo die circumcideret,

‘ qui nondum poterat corde credere, ut ei deputare-  
 ‘ tur ad justitiam; nisi quia et ipsum per seipsum  
 ‘ sacramentum multum valebat? ————— Sicut <sup>288.</sup>  
 ‘ ergo in Abraham præcessit fidei justitia, et accessit (A.D. 388.)  
 ‘ circumcisio signaculum justitiæ fidei: ita in Cor-  
 ‘ nelio præcessit sanctificatio spiritalis in dono Spiri-  
 ‘ tus Sancti, et accessit sacramentum regenerationis  
 ‘ in lavaero baptismi. Et sicut in Isaac, qui octavo  
 ‘ suæ nativitatis die circumcisis est, præcessit sig-  
 ‘ naculum justitiæ fidei; et quoniam patris fidem  
 ‘ imitatus est, secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia  
 ‘ cujus signaculum in infante præcesserat: ita et in  
 ‘ baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacra-  
 ‘ mentum, et si Christianam tenuerint pietatem se-  
 ‘ quetur etiam in corde conversio, cujus mysterium  
 ‘ præcessit in corpore. Et sicut in illo latrone,  
 ‘ quod ex baptismi sacramento defuerat, complevit  
 ‘ Omnipotentis benignitas, quia non superbia vel con-  
 ‘ temptu, sed necessitate defuerat: sic in infantibus,  
 ‘ qui baptizati moriuntur, eadem gratia Omnipotentis  
 ‘ implere credenda est, quod non ex impia voluntate,  
 ‘ sed ex ætatis indigentia nec corde credere ad justi-  
 ‘ tiam possunt, nec ore confiteri ad salutem. Ideo  
 ‘ cum alii pro eis respondent, ut impleatur erga eos  
 ‘ celebratio sacramenti; valet utique ad eorum con-  
 ‘ secrationem; quia ipsi respondere non possunt.  
 ‘ At si pro eo, qui respondere potest, alius respon-  
 ‘ deat, non itidem valet. [cap. xxiv. §. 30.]

‘ Quibus rebus omnibus ostenditur aliud esse sa-  
 ‘ cramentum baptismi, aliud conversionem cordis;  
 ‘ sed salutem hominis ex utroque compleri: nec si  
 ‘ unum horum defuerit, ideo putare debemus conse-  
 ‘ quens esse ut et alterum desit; quia et illud sine  
 ‘ isto potest esse in infante, et hoc sine illo potuit



CHAP.  
XV.

‘ esse in latrone : complente Deo, sive in illo, sive in  
‘ isto, quod non ex voluntate defuisset : cum vero ex  
‘ <sup>288.</sup> voluntate alterum horum defuerit, reatu hominem  
‘ involvi.

‘ Et baptismus quidem potest inesse, ubi conver-  
‘ sio cordis defuerit : conversio autem cordis potest  
‘ quidem inesse non percepto baptismo ; sed con-  
‘ tempto non potest : neque enim ullo modo dicenda  
‘ est conversio cordis ad Deum, cum Dei sacramen-  
‘ tum contemnitur.

‘ Juste igitur reprehendimus, anathemamus, dete-  
‘ stamur, abominamur perversitatem cordis hæreti-  
‘ corum : sacramentum tamen evangelicum non ideo  
‘ non habent, quia per quod utile est non habent.  
‘ Quapropter cum ad fidem et veritatem veniunt, et  
‘ agentes pœnitentiam remitti sibi peccata deprecantur ;  
‘ non eos decipimus, neque fallimus, cum correctos a  
‘ nobis ac reformatos in eo quod depravati atque  
‘ perversi sunt, ad regnum cœlorum sic disciplinis  
‘ cœlestibus erudimus, ut quod in eis integrum est  
‘ nullo modo violemus : nec propter hominis vitium,  
‘ si quid in homine Dei est, vel nullum vel vitiosum  
‘ esse dicamus.’ [cap. xxiv. §. 32.]

‘ And as the thief, who by necessity went without  
‘ baptism, was saved ; because by his piety he had  
‘ it spiritually : so where baptism is had, though the  
‘ party by necessity go without that [faith] which  
‘ the thief had, yet he is saved.

‘ Which the whole body of the church holds, as  
‘ delivered to them, in the case of little infants bap-  
‘ tized : who certainly cannot yet believe with the  
‘ heart to righteousness, or confess with the mouth  
‘ to salvation, as the thief could ; nay, by their cry-  
‘ ing and noise while the sacrament is administering,

‘ they disturb the holy mysteries : and yet no Chris- CHAP.  
XV.  
‘ tian man will say they are baptized to no pur-  
‘ pose. 288.  
(A.D. 388.)

‘ And if any one do ask for divine authority in  
‘ this matter : though that which the whole church  
‘ practises, and which has not been instituted by  
‘ councils, but was ever in use, is very reasonably  
‘ believed to be no other than a thing delivered [or  
‘ ordered] by authority of the apostles : yet we may  
‘ besides take a true estimate, how much the sacra-  
‘ ment of baptism does avail infants, by the circum-  
‘ cision which God’s former people received.

‘ For Abraham was justified before he received  
‘ that ; as Cornelius was indued with the Holy  
‘ Spirit before he was baptized : and yet the apostle  
‘ says of Abraham, *that he received the sign of cir-*  
‘ *cumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith,*  
‘ *by which he had in heart believed, and it had been*  
‘ *counted to him for righteousness.* Why then was  
‘ he commanded thenceforward to circumcise all his  
‘ male infants on the eighth day, when they could  
‘ not yet believe with the heart, that it might be  
‘ counted to them for righteousness ; but for this  
‘ reason, because the sacrament itself is of itself of  
‘ great import ?—Therefore as in Abraham the  
‘ righteousness of faith went before, and circumci-  
‘ sion the seal of the righteousness of faith came  
‘ after ; so in Cornelius the spiritual sanctification  
‘ by the gift of the Holy Spirit went before, and the  
‘ sacrament of regeneration by the laver of baptism  
‘ came after. And as in Isaac, who was circumcised  
‘ the eighth day, the seal of the righteousness of  
‘ faith went before, and (as he was a follower of his  
‘ father’s faith) the righteousness itself, the seal

CHAP. ' whereof had gone before in his infancy, came  
 XV. ' after: so in infants baptized the sacrament of rege-  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.) ' neration goes before, and (if they put in practice  
 ' the Christian religion) conversion of the heart,  
 ' the mystery whereof went before in their body,  
 ' comes after.

' And as in that thief's case, what was wanting  
 ' of the sacrament of baptism the mercy of the  
 ' Almighty made up; because it was not out of  
 ' pride or contempt but of necessity that it was  
 ' wanting: so in infants that die after they are bap-  
 ' tized, it is to be believed that the same grace of  
 ' the Almighty does make up that defect, that by  
 ' reason, not of a wicked will, but of want of age,  
 ' they can neither believe with the heart to right-  
 ' eousness, nor confess with the mouth unto salva-  
 ' tion. So that when others answer for them, that  
 ' they may have this sacrament given them; it is  
 ' valid for their consecration, because they cannot  
 ' answer for themselves: but if for one that is able  
 ' to answer himself another should answer, it would  
 ' not be valid.—By all which it appears, that the  
 ' sacrament of baptism is one thing, and conversion  
 ' of the heart another: but that the salvation of a  
 ' person is completed by both of them. And if one  
 ' of these be wanting, we are not to think that it  
 ' follows, that the other is wanting; since one may  
 ' be without the other in an infant, and the other  
 ' was without that in the thief: God Almighty mak-  
 ' ing up, both in one and the other case, that which  
 ' was not wilfully wanting.

' But when either of these is wilfully wanting, it  
 ' involves the person in guilt. And baptism indeed  
 ' may be had where conversion of the heart is



‘ wanting; but conversion of the heart, though it  
 ‘ may be where baptism is not had, cannot be where  
 ‘ it is contemned: for that is by no means to be  
 ‘ called conversion of the heart to God, where the  
 ‘ sacrament of God is contemned.

CHAP.  
 XV.  
 288.  
 (A D. 388.)

‘ Well may we therefore reprehend, anathema-  
 ‘ tize, detest and abhor, the perversion of heart that  
 ‘ is in heretics: but yet we must not say that they  
 ‘ therefore have not the Gospel sacrament, because  
 ‘ they have not that which should make it useful to  
 ‘ them.

‘ Therefore when they come to the true faith,  
 ‘ and being penitent do desire that their faults may  
 ‘ be pardoned; we do not deceive or cheat them,  
 ‘ when correcting and reforming in them that  
 ‘ wherein they were depraved and perverted, we  
 ‘ do instruct them with holy discipline for the  
 ‘ kingdom of heaven in such a manner, as that we  
 ‘ do by no means violate that in them which is  
 ‘ valid: nor for the fault of the man say that that  
 ‘ which is of God in the man is either null or faulty.’

IV. I have transcribed this passage the larger,  
 because Mr. Danvers, who had set up a pretence  
 that the Donatists found fault with the catholics  
 for baptizing infants, would prove it from this place.  
 He had said ‘ that Austin’s third and fourth books  
 ‘ against the Donatists do demonstrate that they  
 ‘ denied infants baptism: wherein he manageth  
 ‘ the argument for infants’ baptism against them  
 ‘ with great zeal, enforcing it by several arguments,  
 ‘ but especially from apostolical tradition; and  
 ‘ cursing with great bitterness they that should  
 ‘ not embrace it.’ And when his answerers jogged

g Treatise of Baptism, Part ii. ch. vii. p. 223, edit. 1674.

CHAP. him, and told him, that in the third book there was  
 XV. never a word about it; he said, the fourth book did  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.) however shew it. And yet in the fourth book there  
 is nothing but what I here produce. And any one  
 that can give any tolerable guess at the sense of  
 what he reads, sees by this and the rest of the  
 book, that St. Austin does not here argue against  
 the Donatists, as if they denied infant baptism:  
 but proves that baptism received from the hands of  
 heretical or depraved priests is valid, though they  
 give the baptized person a wrong account of the  
 faith; by this reason, that infants' baptism is valid,  
 though they have as yet no account of the faith at  
 all. And I have already shewn from Optatus<sup>h</sup>, that  
 the catholics and Donatists had no difference about  
 the nature of baptism, or way of administering it;  
 but only about the purity or orthodoxy of the per-  
 sons that gave it; and shall by and by have occasion  
 to shew particularly that they baptized infants as  
 well as the catholics<sup>i</sup>.

But what does he mean by saying that St. Austin  
 cursed, &c.?

The Donatists reproached the catholics for receiv-  
 ing to their communion such as had been baptized  
 among heretics, as Arians, Apollinarists, &c., without  
 giving them, upon their coming to the communion  
 of the church, a new baptism: as if they thereby  
 owned communion with such heretics, or approved  
 their doctrine. St. Austin answers as we see, 'We  
 ' do [as well as you] reprehend, anathematize, &c.,  
 ' the perversion of heart, [or false doctrine] of the  
 ' heretics: but we must not therefore say, that they  
 ' have not the sacrament,' &c. This is what this

<sup>h</sup> Ch. 9. §. 1.

<sup>i</sup> Ch. 16. §. 1, 2.

man, who could find antipædobaptism in every Latin book that he looked into, calls ‘cursing them that would not embrace infant baptism.”

CHAP  
XV.  
288.  
(A.D. 388.)

Mr. Baxter says on this occasion, ‘Either this man had seen and read these books of Augustine mentioned by him, or he had not. If not, doth he use God’s church, and the souls of poor ignorant people with any tenderness? &c. If he understand not Latin, how unfit is he to give us the history of these antiquities! &c. But if he have read them, then I can scarce match him again, among all the falsifiers that I know in the world. I dare not be so uncharitable to him, as to think that ever he read them<sup>k</sup>.’ But to leave him, and go on:

Though St. Austin speak of infant baptism in this place but by the by, his words are, we see, a full evidence that it was then universally practised, and had been so beyond the memory of any man or of any record: that they took it to be a thing that had not been ‘enacted by any council,’ but had ‘ever been in use’ from the beginning of Christianity. And they had then but 300 years to look back to the times of the apostles, whereas we now have 1600. And the writings and records which are now lost, were then extant, and easily known.

Moreover, for the sorts or sects of Christians that were then; he says that *nullus Christianorum* ‘none of all the Christians’ (and then certainly not the Donatists with whom he was talking) had any other opinion than that it was useful or necessary.

This is to be understood with a limitation, which

<sup>k</sup> Confutation of the Strange Forgeries of Mr. Henry Danvers, sect. 2. ch. iv. §. 7. [In his ‘More Proofs of Infants’ Church ‘Membership,’ &c. 8vo. 1675. p. 241.]



CHAP. I shall shew<sup>1</sup> that he expresses elsewhere, provided  
 XV. they were such as made use of any baptism at all :  
 —————  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.) for there were some sects that called themselves  
 Christians, (but they were hardly allowed that name  
 by any others,) who utterly refused the use of any  
 baptism at all. Of whom I shall give some account  
 at a place<sup>m</sup> convenient.

§. 5. Out of St. Austin's Letter to Boniface.

*Augustini Epistola ad Bonifacium Episcopum ;*  
 Epist. 23. [98 in edit. Benedict.]

308. §. I. Boniface, a bishop of St. Austin's acquaint-  
 ance, had wrote to him to desire his explication  
 of two matters that appeared to him difficult to  
 resolve. They do both relate to infants' baptism.

One was, ' Whether such parents do their infants  
 ' that are baptized any hurt, who carry them to the  
 ' heathen temples and sacrifices to be cured by those  
 ' impious rites of some infirmity they have. And if  
 ' they thereby do them no hurt, then how it comes  
 ' to pass, that the faith of the parents stands them  
 ' in stead when they are baptized, and yet the apo-  
 ' stasy of their parents does them no hurt.'

The other was, how that can be reconciled to  
 truth, which the godfather answers in the child's  
 name at baptism: viz. that ' he does believe; does  
 ' renounce; will obey,' &c., when he at present has  
 no sense at all, and what he will have hereafter  
 nobody knows.

A part of what St. Austin answers to the first of  
 these, I have already recited in the chapter of St. Cy-  
 prian's sayings<sup>n</sup>: because he does in this answer cite  
 and explain one of the passages of Cyprian, which

<sup>1</sup> Part ii. ch. 5. §. 1.    <sup>m</sup> Part ii. ch. 6. §. 1.    <sup>n</sup> Ch. 6. §. 12.

I had there cited. And another part of it in ch. iii. CHAP.  
XV.  
 §. 4; because it gives a full proof that the ancients  
 took the word regeneration for baptism exclusively 288.  
(A.D. 388.)  
 of all other senses.

The substance of the answer is, that original sin is at first derived from the parents to the child, because the child is at first a part of the parents: that after he is become a separate living person, the faith of the parents, or others that bring him to baptism, is available to him, because ‘ the regenerating Spirit is one in the grown persons that bring the child, and in the child that is brought: but when the same grown persons commit that wickedness on the child, offering him, and endeavouring to engage him in the sacrilegious bonds of devils; there is not then one soul in both of them, that the crime should be communicated. For sin is not so communicated by the will of another which is distinct, as grace is communicated by the Holy Spirit which is one and the same. For the same Holy Spirit may be in this and in that person; although they mutually know it not one of another, and so the grace may be common: but the spirit of a human person cannot be in this and in that person; so that one sinning and the other not sinning, the guilt should be common.’

Some remaining parts of the answer relating to some particular things that Boniface had said, do here follow. [§. 5. tom. ii. p. 265.]

‘ Nec illud te moveat, quod quidam non ea fide ad baptismum percipiendum parvulos ferunt, ut gratia spiritali ad vitam regenerentur æternam, sed quod eos putant hoc remedio temporalem retinere vel recipere sanitatem. Non enim propterea illi

CHAP. XV. 288.  
(A.D. 388.)

‘ non regenerantur, quia non ab istis hac intentione  
 ‘ offeruntur. Celebrantur enim per eos necessaria  
 ‘ ministeria, &c.—Spiritus autem ille sanctus qui  
 ‘ habitat in sanctis, ex quibus una illa columba de-  
 ‘ argentata charitatis igne conflatur, agit quod agit  
 ‘ etiam per servitutum, aliquando non solum sim-  
 ‘ pliciter ignorantium, verum etiam damnabiliter  
 ‘ indignorum. Offeruntur quippe parvuli ad perci-  
 ‘ piendam spiritalem gratiam non tam ab eis quorum  
 ‘ gestantur manibus, (quamvis et ab ipsis si et  
 ‘ ipsi boni fideles sunt,) quam ab universa societate  
 ‘ sanctorum atque fidelium. Ab omnibus namque  
 ‘ offerri recte intelliguntur quibus placet quod  
 ‘ offeruntur, et quorum sancta atque individua  
 ‘ charitate ad communicationem Sancti Spiritus ad-  
 ‘ juvantur. Tota hoc ergo mater ecclesia, quæ in  
 ‘ sanctis est, facit; quia tota omnes, tota singulos  
 ‘ parit. Nam si Christiani baptismi sacramentum,  
 ‘ quando unum atque idipsum est, etiam apud hære-  
 ‘ ticos valet et sufficit ad consecrationem, quamvis  
 ‘ ad vitæ æternæ participationem non sufficiat: quæ  
 ‘ consecratio reum quidem facit hæreticum extra  
 ‘ Domini gregem habentem Dominicum characterem;  
 ‘ corrigendum tamen admonet sana doctrina, non  
 ‘ iterum similiter consecrandum: quanto potius in  
 ‘ catholica ecclesia etiam per stipulæ ministerium  
 ‘ frumenta purganda portantur, ut ad massæ so-  
 ‘ cietatem mediante area perducantur?

‘ Illud autem nolo te fallat, ut existimes reatus  
 ‘ vinculum ex Adam tractum, aliter non posse  
 ‘ dirumpi, nisi parvuli ad percipiendam Christi  
 ‘ gratiam a parentibus offerantur. Sic enim scribens  
 ‘ dicis; ut sicut parentes fuerunt auctores ad eorum  
 ‘ pœnam, per fidem parentum identidem justificen-



‘ tur: cum videas multos non offeri a parentibus, CHAP.  
XV.  
‘ sed etiam a quibuslibet extraneis; sicut a dominis  
‘ servuli aliquando offeruntur. Et nonnunquam, 288.  
(A.D. 388.)  
‘ mortuis parentibus suis, parvuli baptizantur, ab eis  
‘ oblatis, qui illis hujusmodi misericordiam præbere  
‘ potuerunt. Aliquando etiam, quos crudeliter  
‘ parentes exposuerunt nutriendos a quibuslibet,  
‘ nonnunquam a sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab  
‘ eis offeruntur ad baptismum, quæ certe proprios  
‘ filios nec habuerunt ullos, nec habere disponunt.’  
[§. 6.]

II. ‘ Let not that disturb you, that some people  
‘ do not bring their infants to baptism with that  
‘ faith [or purpose] that they may by spiritual grace  
‘ be regenerated to eternal life, but because they  
‘ think they do procure or preserve their bodily  
‘ health by this remedy. For the children do not  
‘ therefore fail of being regenerated, because they are  
‘ not brought by the others with this intention. For  
‘ the necessary offices are performed by them, &c.  
‘ —And the Holy Spirit that dwells in the saints,  
‘ out of whom that silver dove that is but one is by  
‘ the fire of charity compacted, does what he does  
‘ sometimes by the means of men not only simply  
‘ ignorant, but also damnably unworthy. For in-  
‘ fants are offered for the receiving of the spiritual  
‘ grace, not so much by those in whose hands they  
‘ are brought, (though by those too if they be good  
‘ faithful Christians,) as by the whole congregation  
‘ of saints, and faithful men. For they are rightly  
‘ said to be offered by all those whose desire it is  
‘ that they should be offered, and by whose holy and  
‘ united charity they are assisted towards the com-  
‘ munication of the Holy Spirit.

CHAP.  
XV.<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

‘ So that the whole church of the saints does this  
 ‘ office as a mother. For the whole church brings  
 ‘ forth all her children, and the whole brings forth  
 ‘ each particular.

‘ For if the sacrament of Christian baptism, which  
 ‘ is one and the same, be available even among  
 ‘ heretics for the consecration of a person, though it  
 ‘ be not sufficient for his obtaining of eternal life  
 ‘ (which consecration involves the heretic in the  
 ‘ guilt of sin for using the Lord’s mark without the  
 ‘ compass of the Lord’s flock : and yet the orthodox  
 ‘ doctrine teaches that such a person is to be re-  
 ‘ formed, but not to be consecrated anew) :—how  
 ‘ much more in the catholic church may the corn  
 ‘ that is to be cleaned, be brought in by the means  
 ‘ of the straw, that by the help of the floor it may  
 ‘ be gathered to the rest of the heap ?

III. ‘ But I would not have you mistake so as to  
 ‘ think that the bond of guilt derived from Adam  
 ‘ cannot be broken, unless the children be offered for  
 ‘ receiving the grace of Christ by their own parents.  
 ‘ For so you speak in your letter, “ That as the pa-  
 ‘ rents were authors of their punishment, so they  
 ‘ may also by the faith of their parents be justified ;”  
 ‘ whereas you see that a great many are offered,  
 ‘ not by their parents, but by any other persons ; as  
 ‘ the infant slaves are sometimes offered by their  
 ‘ masters. And sometimes when the parents are  
 ‘ dead, the infants are baptized, being offered by  
 ‘ any that can afford to shew this compassion on  
 ‘ them. And sometimes infants whom their parents  
 ‘ have cruelly exposed, to be brought up by those  
 ‘ that light on them, are now and then taken up by  
 ‘ the holy virgins, and offered to baptism by them

‘ who have no children of their own, nor design to  
 ‘ have any. And in all this there is nothing else  
 ‘ done than what is written in the Gospel, when our  
 ‘ Lord asked who was neighbour to him that was  
 ‘ wounded by thieves, and left half dead in the  
 ‘ road? and it was answered, *He that shewed mercy*  
 ‘ *on him.*’

CHAP.  
XV.

288.  
(A.D. 388.)

Here we see (beside the resolution of the main question, both Boniface and St. Austin taking it for granted that infants are to be baptized) that the ordinary use then was for the parents to answer for their children: but yet that this was not counted so necessary as that a child could not be baptized without that circumstance. Any one that was on any equitable account owner of the child might bring it to baptism.

Neither did the baptism depend on the holiness, or right faith, or intention of those that brought the child. It was supposed to be done by the order and at the desire of the church, and particularly of those that assisted with their prayers at the office.

IV. He next proceeds to speak of the other question put by Boniface:

‘ Difficillimam sane quæstionem tibi proposuisse  
 ‘ visus es in extremo inquisitionis tuæ: ea videlicet  
 ‘ intentione qua soles vehementer cavere mendacium.  
 ‘ Si constituam, inquis, ante te parvulum, et interro-  
 ‘ gem utrum cum creverit, futurus sit castus, vel fur  
 ‘ non sit futurus: sine dubio respondebis; Nescio.  
 ‘ Et utrum in eadem parvula ætate constitutus co-  
 ‘ gitet aliquid boni vel mali; dices, Nescio. Si ita-  
 ‘ que de moribus ejus futuris nihil audes certi pro-  
 ‘ mittere, et de præsentī ejus cogitatione: Quid est  
 ‘ illud quod quando ad baptismum offeruntur, pro



CHAP. ' eis parentes tanquam fidedictores respondent, et  
XV. ' dicunt illos facere quod illa ætas cogitare non

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.) ' potest, aut si potest, occultum est? interrogamus  
' enim eos, a quibus offeruntur, et dicimus; Credit  
' in Deum? de illa ætate quæ, utrum sit Deus,  
' ignorat: respondent, Credit: et ad cætera sic  
' respondetur singula quæ quærentur. Unde miror  
' parentes in istis rebus tam fidenter pro parvulo  
' respondere, ut dicant eum tanta bona facere, quæ  
' ad horam qua baptizatur, baptizator interrogat:  
' tamen eadem hora si subijciam; Erit castus qui  
' baptizatur? Aut, Non erit fur? Nescio utrum audet  
' dicere aliquis, Aliquid horum erit, aut, non erit;  
' sicut mihi sine dubitatione respondet, quod credat  
' in Deum, et quod se convertat ad Deum.

' Deinde scripta tua concludens adjungis et dicis;  
' Ad istas ergo quæstiones peto breviter respondere  
' digneris, ita ut non mihi de consuetudine præscri-  
' bas, sed rationem reddas. [§. 7.]

' His literis tuis lectis et relectis, et quantum tem-  
' poris angustia sinebant consideratis, recordatus  
' sum Nebridium amicum meum; qui cum esset re-  
' rum obscurarum, ad doctrinam pietatis maxime  
' pertinentium, diligentissimus et acerrimus inquisi-  
' tor, valde oderat de quæstione magna responsionem  
' brevem: et quisquis hoc poposcisset, ægerrime  
' ferebat; eumque, si ejus persona pateretur, vultu  
' indignabundus et voce cohibebat; indignum depu-  
' tans qui talia quæreret, cum de re tanta, quam  
' multa dici possent deberentque, nesciret. Sed ego  
' tibi non similiter, ut solebat ille, succenseo. Es  
' enim episcopus multis curis occupatus, ut ego:  
' unde nec tibi facile vacat prolixum aliquid legere,  
' nec mihi scribere. Nam ille tunc adolescens, qui

‘ talia breviter nolebat audire, et de multis in nostra C H A P.  
XV.  
‘ sermocinatione quærebat, ab otioso quærebat otio-  
‘ sus. Tu vero cogitans nunc quis et a quo ista 288.  
(A.D. 388.)  
‘ flagites, breviter de re tanta respondere me jubes.  
‘ Ecce facio quantum possum: Dominus adjuvet, ut  
‘ quod postulas possim. [§. 8.]

‘ Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut pascha propin-  
‘ quante dicamus, crastinam vel perendinam Domini  
‘ passionem; cum ille ante tam multos annos passus  
‘ sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit.  
‘ Nempe ipso die Dominico dicimus; Hodie Dominus  
‘ resurrexit: cum ex quo resurrexit tot anni trans-  
‘ ierint. Cur nemo tam ineptus est, ut nos ita  
‘ loquentes arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies  
‘ secundum illorum, quibus hæc gesta sunt, simili-  
‘ tudinem nuncupamus? Ut dicatur ipse dies, qui  
‘ non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus:  
‘ et dicatur illo die fieri propter sacramenti celebra-  
‘ tionem, quod non illo die, sed jam olim factum est.  
‘ Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? et  
‘ tamen in sacramento, non solum per omnes paschæ  
‘ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur; nec  
‘ utique mentitur, qui interrogatus eum responderit  
‘ immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandam similitu-  
‘ dinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non  
‘ haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac  
‘ autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum  
‘ nomina accipiunt.

‘ Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacra-  
‘ mentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacra-  
‘ mentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est; ita  
‘ sacramentum fidei fides est. Nihil est autem aliud  
‘ credere, quam fidem habere. Ac per hoc cum  
‘ respondetur parvulus credere, qui fidei nondum

CHAP. XV. <sup>288.</sup>  
 (A.D. 388.) ‘habet affectum; respondetur fidem habere propter  
 ‘fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum  
 ‘propter conversionis sacramentum; quia et ipsa re-  
 ‘sponsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. Sicut  
 ‘de ipso baptismo apostolus; *Consepulti*, inquit, *su-*  
 ‘*mus Christo per baptismum in mortem*. Non ait,  
 ‘Sepulturam significavimus: sed prorsus ait: *Con-*  
 ‘*sepulti sumus*. Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non  
 ‘nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit. [§. 9.]

‘Itaque parvulum, et si nondum fides illa, quæ in  
 ‘credentium voluntate consistit, jam tamen ipsius  
 ‘fidei sacramentum fidelem facit. Nam sicut credere  
 ‘respondetur, ita etiam fidelis vocatur, non rem  
 ‘ipsam mente annuendo, sed ipsius rei sacramentum  
 ‘percipiendo. Cum autem homo sapere cœperit,  
 ‘non illud sacramentum repetet, sed intelliget:  
 ‘ejusque veritati consona etiam voluntate coapta-  
 ‘bitur. Hoc quamdiu non potest, valebit sacramen-  
 ‘tum ad ejus tutelam adversus contrarias potestates:  
 ‘et tantum valebit, ut si ante rationis usum ex hac  
 ‘vita emigraverit, per ipsum sacramentum, commen-  
 ‘dante ecclesiæ charitate, ab illa *condemnatione, quæ*  
 ‘*per unum hominem intravit in mundum*, Christiano  
 ‘adjutorio liberetur. Hoc qui non credit, et fieri  
 ‘non posse arbitratur, profecto infidelis est, etsi  
 ‘habeat fidei sacramentum: longèque melior est ille  
 ‘parvulus, qui etiamsi fidem nondum habeat in cogi-  
 ‘tatione, non ei tamen obicem contrariæ cogitationis  
 ‘opponit; unde sacramentum ejus salubriter percipit.

‘Respondi, sicut existimo, quæstionibus tuis, quan-  
 ‘tum attinet ad minus capaces et contentiosos non  
 ‘satis, quantum autem ad pacatos et intelligentes  
 ‘plus forte quam sat est. Nec tibi ad excusationem  
 ‘meam objeci firmissimam consuetudinem, sed salu-



‘ berrimæ consuetudinis reddidi quam potui ratio- CHAP.  
nem.’ [§. 10.] XV.

‘ You reckon you have proposed a very hard ques-<sup>288.</sup>  
tion in the latter part of your letter, according to (A.D. 388.)  
‘ that temper of yours by which you are wont to be  
‘ exceeding cautious of any thing that looks like a  
‘ lie. You say thus :

‘ Suppose I set before you an infant, and ask you  
‘ whether, when he grows up, he will be a chaste  
‘ man, or, whether he will be no thief? your answer  
‘ doubtless will be, I cannot tell. And, whether he  
‘ in that infant age have any good or evil thought :  
‘ you will say, I know not. Since therefore you  
‘ dare not say any thing either concerning his fu-  
‘ ture behaviour, or his present thoughts; what is  
‘ the meaning that when they are brought to bap-  
‘ tism, their parents, as sponsors for them, make  
‘ answer and say, that they do that which that age  
‘ can have no thoughts of; or if they have, nobody  
‘ knows what they are? For we ask those by whom  
‘ they are brought, and say, Does he believe in God?  
‘ concerning that age which has no knowledge whe-  
‘ ther there be a God or not : they answer, He does  
‘ believe. And so in like manner answer is made  
‘ to all the rest. So that I wonder how the parents  
‘ do in those matters answer so confidently for the  
‘ child that he does this or that good thing, which  
‘ the baptizer demands at the time of his baptism :  
‘ and yet, if at the same time I ask, Will this bap-  
‘ tized person prove chaste, or, not prove a thief? I  
‘ question whether any one dare so answer, he will,  
‘ or will not, be such or such a one ; as they answer  
‘ without any hesitation that he does believe in God:  
‘ he does turn to God.

CHAP.  
XV.

‘ And then you conclude your letter with these  
‘ words :

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.) ‘ “I entreat you to give me a short answer to these  
‘ questions, in such a manner as that you do not  
‘ urge to me the prescription of the customariness of  
‘ the thing, but give me the reason of it.’

‘ When I had read your letter over and over, and  
‘ had considered it as far as my short time would  
‘ allow ; it made me call to mind my friend Nebri-  
‘ dius, who being a very diligent and sagacious in-  
‘ quirer into matters that were obscure, especially  
‘ such as concern religion, could not endure a short  
‘ answer to a weighty question, and took it very ill  
‘ if any one desired such a thing ; and would with  
‘ an angry voice and look reprimand him, if he were  
‘ a person that might be so used, as counting him  
‘ unfit to ask such questions ; who did not consider  
‘ how much might and ought to be said on so great  
‘ a matter.

‘ But, I do not pretend to be angry with you in  
‘ such manner as he was wont to be ; for you are a  
‘ bishop that have a great many cares upon you, as  
‘ well as I : so that neither have you the leisure to  
‘ read a long discourse, nor I to write one. For he  
‘ being then a young man that would not be an-  
‘ swered in brief to such things, but spent a great  
‘ deal of talk with me, inquired as one at leisure  
‘ from one that was so too. But you, considering  
‘ now your own circumstances that ask, and mine that  
‘ am asked, bid me answer briefly about so great a  
‘ matter. And that I here do as well as I can : I pray  
‘ God to assist me, that I may be able to satisfy your  
‘ demand.

‘ You know we often express ourselves so, as that

‘ when Good Friday is nigh, we say, To-morrow or CHAP.  
 ‘ next day is our Lord’s passion: though it be a XV.  
 ‘ great many years ago that he suffered, and his <sup>288.</sup>  
 ‘ passion was never performed but once. So on the (A.D. 388.)  
 ‘ Lord’s day we say, This day our Lord arose, though  
 ‘ since he arose it be so many years. Why is there  
 ‘ nobody so silly as to say we lie when we speak so,  
 ‘ but for this reason, because we give names to those  
 ‘ days, from the representation they make us of those  
 ‘ on which the things were indeed done: so as that  
 ‘ is called the very day, which is not the very day,  
 ‘ but answers to it in the revolution of time: and  
 ‘ that which is not done on that day, but was done  
 ‘ a long time ago, is spoken of as done on that day,  
 ‘ because the sacrament of it is then celebrated.  
 ‘ Was not Christ in his own person offered up (or  
 ‘ sacrificed) once for all? And yet in the sacrament  
 ‘ he is offered in the church (or in, or to, or among  
 ‘ the people) not only every Easter, but every day;  
 ‘ nor does he lie, who being asked, says, he is of-  
 ‘ fered. For sacraments would not be sacraments,  
 ‘ if they had not a resemblance of those things  
 ‘ whereof they are the sacraments: and from this  
 ‘ resemblance they commonly have the names of the  
 ‘ things themselves.

‘ As therefore the sacrament of Christ’s body is  
 ‘ after a certain fashion Christ’s body:—and the sa-  
 ‘ crament of Christ’s blood is Christ’s blood:—so  
 ‘ the sacrament of faith is faith, and to believe is  
 ‘ nothing else but to have faith. And so, when an  
 ‘ infant that has not yet the faculty of faith is said  
 ‘ to believe; he is said to have faith, because of the  
 ‘ sacrament of faith; and to turn to God, because of  
 ‘ the sacrament of conversion: because that answer



CHAP. ‘ belongs to the celebration of the sacrament. So  
 XV. ‘ the apostle on this same subject of baptism says,  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.) ‘ *We are buried together with Christ by baptism*  
 ‘ *unto death*<sup>o</sup>: he does not say, We signify a burial,  
 ‘ but he uses the word itself, *We are buried*. So  
 ‘ that he calls the sacrament of so great a thing by  
 ‘ the name of the thing itself.

‘ And so an infant, though he be not yet consti-  
 ‘ tuted a *fidel* (a faithful Christian) by that faith  
 ‘ which consists in the will of believers; yet he is  
 ‘ by the sacrament of that faith: for as he is said to  
 ‘ believe, so he is called a *fidel*, not from his having  
 ‘ the thing itself in his mind, but from his receiving  
 ‘ the sacrament of it.

‘ And when a person begins to have a sense of  
 ‘ things, he does not repeat that sacrament, but un-  
 ‘ derstands the force of it, and by consent of will  
 ‘ squares himself to the true meaning of it. And till  
 ‘ he can do this, the sacrament will avail to his pre-  
 ‘ servation against all contrary powers: and so far  
 ‘ it will avail, that if he depart this life before the  
 ‘ use of reason, he will by this Christian remedy of  
 ‘ the sacrament itself (the charity of the church re-  
 ‘ commending him) be made free from that *con-*  
 ‘ *demnation, which by one man entered into the*  
 ‘ *world*<sup>p</sup>

‘ He that does not believe this, and thinks it can-  
 ‘ not be done, is indeed an infidel, though he have  
 ‘ the sacrament of faith. And that infant is much  
 ‘ better, who though he have not faith in his mind,  
 ‘ yet puts no bar of a contrary mind against it, and  
 ‘ so receives the sacrament to his soul’s health.

‘ I have given such an answer to your questions

<sup>o</sup> Rom. vi. 4.

<sup>p</sup> Ch. v. 18.

‘ as I suppose is, to ignorant or contentious people  
 ‘ not enough, and to understanding and quiet people  
 ‘ perhaps more than enough. Neither have I, to  
 ‘ spare my pains, urged to you the custom’s being so  
 ‘ firmly grounded: but I have, as well as I could,  
 ‘ explained to you the reason of that wholesome  
 ‘ custom.’

C H A P.  
XV.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

How skilful or judicious the reader will judge this explication of the reason of the custom to be, I know not. Nor is it much material; since we are not now inquiring how acute St. Austin was, but what it was that he and the rest knew to be true in point of fact. And hereby we perceive plainly these matters following.

V. 1. That that was the practice for the godfathers (who were, as I said, usually the parents) to make these answers in the child’s name. The use of godfathers appeared before<sup>9</sup> from the words of Tertullian; but here it is set forth more particularly: and St. Austin says that these answers do belong to [or are a necessary appertenance of] the sacrament: and he had said in the former part of the letter, (which I omitted because of the length,) that they are *verba sacramentorum, sine quibus parvulus consecrari non potest*; ‘ words of the sacrament, without which an infant cannot be baptized.’ Whether he would not have excepted the case of necessity in danger of sudden death (as the church of England does) if there had been occasion of speaking of that, I know not: but it is plain he would have been against those that either decry this practice, or count it a thing of no moment. The church of Christ has always taken care that the blessings of

<sup>9</sup> Chap. 4. §. 9.

CHAP. God promised in this sacrament may be understood as  
 XV. conveyed conditionally or by way of covenant ; which  
 (A.D. 388.)<sup>288.</sup> these questions and answers do most lively express.

VI. 2. We see that they then held as certain,  
 ‘ that children which are baptized, dying before  
 ‘ they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved :’  
 for St. Austin here says in these last words that ‘ he  
 ‘ that does not believe this is an infidel :’ which he  
 would not say, if it had been counted at all doubtful.  
 The same thing might have been observed from  
 what he says above, sect. 3. §. 2, ‘ God forbid that I  
 ‘ should make any question whether infants regene-  
 ‘ rated and dying in infancy do come to eternal sal-  
 ‘ vation.’

III. If those learned Benedictines, who have managed the last edition of this father’s works<sup>r</sup> to set his books and epistles in their chronological order, have placed this epistle right ; then we see here another proof of the mistake of Grotius<sup>s</sup>, who maintains as I said<sup>t</sup>, that St. Austin, before he was heated with the Pelagian controversy, did never assert the condemnation of infants dying unbaptized, no not to those lesser or milder sufferings in the world to come. For they place this epistle (which is in their edition the ninety-eighth) anno Dom. 408 ; which was before Pelagius vented his heresy : and yet here St. Austin, in saying, ‘ They will, if they die before  
 ‘ the use of reason, be freed by this Christian remedy  
 ‘ of the sacrament from that condemnation which by  
 ‘ one man entered into the world,’ plainly supposes that they would otherwise have been liable to it.

<sup>r</sup> [In eleven volumes folio, published at Paris, 1679—1700, and reprinted at Antwerp, with an appendix, in 1700—1703.]

<sup>s</sup> Annot. in Matt. xix. 14.

<sup>t</sup> Sect. 3. §. 2.



VII. 4. There are two other things observable C H A P.  
XV.  
 from his words here, which are well worth the 288.  
A.D. 388.)  
 noting, though they do not relate to our subject. One is, that he speaks so as that we may be sure he had no notion of transubstantiation. For to say, that ‘sacraments have a likeness [or resemblance] ‘of those things whereof they are the sacraments; ‘and from this resemblance they commonly have ‘the names of the things themselves;’ and to exemplify this by saying, ‘The sacrament of Christ’s ‘body is Christ’s body, and the sacrament of his ‘blood is his blood after a certain manner’ [or fashion]; and to speak of this as a thing so understood by all, is proof enough that he neither believed, nor had conceived or heard of any such doctrine as makes the body and blood of Christ to be there in a proper sense.

VIII. 5. Another is, that it was then the common custom for Christians in some churches, and probably in that where he lived, to receive the communion of Christ’s body every day. For so he says, ‘Christ in himself [or in his own person] was offered [or sacrificed] but once: but yet in the sacrament [or in a sacramental way] he is offered up ‘every day.’ It is certain this was the custom then of the Christians at Rome: and that in many of the eastern churches, and some of the western, the custom was not to receive so often. For St. Hierome and St. Austin have each of them written letters on this subject in answer to some that had desired their opinion in relation to this difference; as Aug. Epist. 118. [ed. Benedict. 54.] *ad Januarium*: Hieronym. Epist. 28, [edit. Benedict. 52. Vallars. 71.] *ad Lucinum Bæticum*: See also Aug. *de*

CHAP. *Sermone Domini in Monte*, lib. ii. cap. 7. §. 26, 27.  
XV.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.) and *Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm.* cap. 63<sup>u</sup>. Their opinion is, that in that and all such like ‘matters that are not ‘determined by scripture, nor by the authority of ‘the universal church, one should follow the usage ‘of that church in which one lives.’ And St. Austin there says, that he had by long experience found this rule (which had been given him by St. Ambrose) to be of unspeakable use for the quieting men’s minds, and for the peace of the church.

This they say of receiving every day: but no person then would have spoken with such indifference of the custom of any people (if there had then been any such) that used to receive so seldom as many among the protestants nowadays do. For Gennadius, *loc. citat.*, says, ‘Those that communicate every day I do neither commend nor blame: ‘but I would advise and persuade people to communicate every Lord’s day; provided they have a ‘purpose of forsaking sin.—But this I speak of ‘those who have not any capital or mortal crimes ‘lying on their consciences,’ &c. Those he advises to do penance first.

IX. 6. He does both in this letter, and also in the passage last before rehearsed, and in many other places, so speak as plainly to shew that he did not think nor pretend that infants that are baptized have in any proper sense faith or repentance, or conversion of the heart, &c. How much soever he is here pressed with the difficulty of explaining the reason why the godfather answers in the child’s name, ‘he ‘does believe:’ he does not for all that fly to the

<sup>u</sup> [Gennadius Massiliensis: Liber de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, 4<sup>o</sup>. Hamburgi, 1614.]

justifying of so great a paradox, as to say that the child does indeed in a proper sense understand, believe, or disbelieve any thing. He shews the words are true in a sacramental sense, but does not maintain they are so in a proper one. Nay, he plainly yields they are not: he grants that infants ‘cannot as yet either believe with the heart, or confess with the mouth.’

And when at other places<sup>x</sup> he argues that infants, after they are baptized, are no longer to be counted either among the *infidels* or *catechumeni*, but among the *fideles* or *credentes*; yet still he means and explains himself, as he does here, ‘That they are constituted *fideles*, not by that faith which consists in the will of believers, but by the sacrament of that faith.’

He does indeed hold that the Holy Spirit does do offices for the infant, and is in the infant: you see here his words, ‘the regenerating spirit is one in those that bring the child, and in the child that is brought.’ And in that part of the epistle which I left out because of the length, he says, ‘Aqua exhibens forinsecus sacramentum gratiæ, et spiritus operans intrinsecus beneficium gratiæ, solvens vinculum culpæ,’ &c. [§. 2.] ‘The water affording outwardly the sacrament of the grace, and the spirit operating inwardly the benefit of the grace, loosing the bond of guilt,’ &c., do regeuerate. But he supposes the infants to be merely passive, and not to know, understand, or cooperate any thing themselves.

In his epistle to Dardanus, he says, ‘It is a

<sup>x</sup> De Peccatorum Meritis, lib. i. cap. 25, 33, &c. [Tom. x. p. 1. ed. Bened.]



CHAP. 'wonderful thing to consider how God dwells in  
 XV. 'some that know him not, and in some that do  
 288. 'know him he does not dwell. For they who, when  
 (A.D. 388.) 'they know God, glorify him not as God, nor are  
 'thankful, do not belong to his temple; and infants  
 'sanctified by the sacrament of Christ, regenerated  
 'by the Holy Spirit, do belong to his temple; who,  
 'though they be regenerated, cannot yet by reason  
 'of their age know God.' And afterward, 'we affirm  
 'therefore that the Holy Spirit dwells in baptized  
 'infants though they know it not; for after the  
 'same manner they know him not, though he be in  
 'them, as they know not their own soul: the reason  
 'whereof which they cannot yet make use of, is in  
 'them as a spark raked up, which will kindle as  
 'they grow in years.' [§. 17.]

Some modern divines, especially of the Lutherans, have gone further, and do<sup>z</sup> maintain that infants have faith, and do believe after a certain manner; but not in the same way or manner that adult people do, whose faith comes by hearing, thought, meditation, understanding, &c., for they grant that infants have none of these: and what sort of faith is it that they have cannot, as they confess, be explained.

But a late philosophical divine of the church of Rome has outdone all. He has<sup>a</sup> acquainted us with

<sup>y</sup> Epist. 57. [Ed. Benedict. 187.]

<sup>z</sup> Chemnitii Examen Concilii Tridentini, pt. ii. de baptismo, §. x. canon. 13. p. 334. edit. Francof. 1707.

<sup>a</sup> Malbranch, Treatise concerning the Search after Truth, translated by T. Taylor, fol. London, 1700. Illustrations on ch. vii. of the 1st part of the second book. [Vol. i. p. 56. ii. p. 126, &c. The original French appeared in the year 1674. and a Latin version in 1685.]

the mechanism by which original sin is formed CHAP. XV.  
in the brain of an infant before he is born, and 

---

  
also how at baptism it is rectified; it is worth 288.  
knowing. (A.D. 388.)

It is thus: the mother has a sinful inclination and love to the world, pleasure, &c. There are tracks or traces in her brain running all this way. The child in her womb has by sympathy the same traces bred in his brain; so he has, before he is born, corrupt inclinations and is a sinner. The difficulty is, how this is rectified at baptism.

For this, he supposes the child to have at the time of baptism one strong actual motion of love to God; and says, ‘One single instant is sufficient for the exercise of that act of love. And concupiscence is as it were mortified that moment.’ And the strangest thing that he says is, ‘It should not be thought strange, that I suppose it possible for children to love God with a love of choice at the time of their baptism. For since,’ &c.

I think this learned author does somewhere<sup>b</sup> observe in his book, that ‘men of learning are most subject to error.’ and, ‘that those who are most hot in the search of truth are the men that lead us into infinite errors.’ He gives several reasons for this, why such men do sometimes fall into greater mistakes than vulgar people. One more may perhaps be added to them; vulgar people, having no assistance from learning or philosophy, have nothing but common sense to trust to; so they generally keep close to that: they seldom allow themselves to maintain any opinion that is very remote from it. It was not these men that adventured first to teach

<sup>b</sup> Book ii. pt. 2. ch. 4.

CHAP. the world, that that is in a proper sense the body of  
 XV.  
 ————— a man, which we see, when we have it in our hands,  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.) to be a piece of bread. On the contrary, they can  
 hardly believe it, though the learned have taught  
 them so. Neither was it for one of them to have  
 found with all their search this truth, that an infant  
 at the time of baptism loves God with a love of  
 choice. They will hardly believe it of any infant  
 at any time: much less when they see the child fast  
 asleep at the time of baptism, or (as St. Austin  
 observes<sup>c</sup> they often are) in a fit of crying and fret-  
 fulness all the while; which, as he remarks, would  
 be very sinful, if they had any understanding.

The aforesaid author says indeed, ‘We ought not  
 ‘ positively to affirm this, that children are justified  
 ‘ by formal acts of their will.’ And he had reason;  
 for the Council of Trent suppose the contrary, when  
 they say, ‘If any one shall say that baptized infants,  
 ‘ because they have not the act of believing, are not  
 ‘ to be accounted *fideles*, &c., let him be anathema<sup>d</sup>.’  
 I suppose that church have at last learned not to  
 hang any more millstones on the neck of their  
 religion.

He says also, ‘They that have treated of the effect  
 ‘ of baptism in the ages past, have omitted the ex-  
 ‘ plaining the regeneration of infants by the actual  
 ‘ motions of their heart; not that they were induced  
 ‘ by strong reasons to judge it impossible; for their  
 ‘ works do not shew they have ever so much as  
 ‘ examined it.’ But St. Austin thought the evidence  
 of sense to be a strong reason, when he says in  
 the foresaid epistle to Dardanus; ‘If we should go

<sup>c</sup> Epist. 57. [ed. Benedict. 187.]

<sup>d</sup> Sess. 7. Can. de baptismo, 13.



‘ about to prove by discourse, that infants, which as CHAP. XV.  
 ‘ yet have no knowledge of human things, have 288.  
 ‘ knowledge of divine things, I am afraid we should (A.D. 388.)  
 ‘ seem to offer an affront to our senses; when, let  
 ‘ us say what we will, the evidence of the truth  
 ‘ overpowers all the force of our talk<sup>e</sup>.’ He was  
 not so hardy as either in this or the other sacrament, or in any other point to tack any thing to our faith that is contrary to our sense. And he goes on there to observe that infants, even then when they begin to talk, have so little sense or understanding, that if they should always keep to that pitch, they would be idiots.

Most of the pædobaptists go no further than St. Austin does; they hold that God, by his Spirit, does at the time of baptism, seal and apply to the infant that is there dedicated to him, the promises of the covenant of which he is capable, viz. adoption, pardon of sin, translation from the state of nature to that of grace, &c. On which account the infant is said to be regenerated of [or by] the Spirit. Not that God does by any miracle at that time illuminate or convert the mind of the child. And for original sin, or the corruption of nature, they hold that God by his covenant does abolish the guilt of it, receives the child to his mercy in Christ, and consigns to him by promise such grace as shall afterward, by the use of means, if he live, be sufficient to keep it under, but not wholly to extirpate it in this life. It is left as the subject of trial and of a continual Christian warfare. And this is the opinion of St. Austin<sup>f</sup> and of the ancients in general.

The Pelagians on the other side set their brains

<sup>e</sup> Epist. 57. [187,]      <sup>f</sup> Contra Julianum, lib. vi. c. 5, 6, 7.

CHAP. to work to find some actual sin in an infant. It was  
 XV. to their purpose: for since they took on them to  
<sup>288.</sup>  
 (A.D. 388.) deny original sin, and were pressed with that argu-  
 ment most of all, that the reason why infants are  
 baptized, is for forgiveness of sin, they, for an eva-  
 sion, would sometimes say, that their peevishness  
 and fretful crying as soon as they are born, is a sin<sup>g</sup>,  
 and they may be baptized for the forgiveness of that  
 or such like sins. St. Austin explodes that rather  
 more than the other; as being a thing that nobody  
 would ever say but to serve an hypothesis: that ‘if  
 ‘they would calmly think of it, they would change  
 ‘their opinion; and if they will not,’ says he, ‘we  
 ‘shall not have so ill an opinion of human sense, as  
 ‘to fear that any body will be persuaded by them.’  
 He takes nothing to be plainer than this, that a child  
 before the use of reason can have neither actual sin  
 nor actual faith.

Sect. 6. Out of St. Austin’s books *De Genesi  
 ad literam*.

*De Genesi ad literam*, lib. 10.

St. Austin began and made a good progress in  
 these books on Genesis long before Pelagius began  
 to stir: but other work intervening, he did not finish  
 and publish them till some time after. I do not  
 observe any thing in them that seems to have any  
 respect to the dispute with him. In this tenth book  
 he handles the point of the origin of the human  
 soul; whether every person’s soul be by immediate  
 creation, or whether, as the body of a man is de-  
 rived from the body of his parents, so his soul also  
 be derived from their soul. He recites the argu-  
 ments on both sides.

<sup>g</sup> August. de Peccatorum Meritis, lib. i. [cap. 35. §. 65.]

He observes<sup>b</sup> that the derivation of original sin from our first parents upon all their posterity is made by many an argument for the propagation of souls as well as bodies. They instanced in infants, concerning whom they argued thus: If we say they be derived from Adam, in respect of their bodies only, and not in respect of their souls, we must have a care that we do not either make God to be the author of sin, (if he put the soul into a body in which it must needs sin,) or else suffer it to be believed that there may be some soul, beside our Saviour Christ's, which has no need of the Christian grace to free it from sin. Which last is, say they, 'so contrary to the belief of the church, that parents run with their infants and little ones, to procure the grace of holy baptism. In whom if that bond of sin be loosed, which is of the body only, and not that which is of the soul too, it may well be asked what hurt it would do them, if at that age they should die without baptism; for if this sacrament be for the good of their body, and not of their soul too, they might be baptized after they were dead. But when as we see that the church universally observes this, to run with them while they are alive, and to help them while they are alive, lest when they are dead there be nothing to be done that can do them any good; we see not what else can be made of it, but that every infant is of Adam both as to his body and as to his soul.'

[§. 19.]

And afterward<sup>i</sup>, this argument is carried on thus: 'What has the soul of an infant deserved, that it

CHAP.  
XV.

288.  
(A.D. 388.)

<sup>b</sup> Cap. 11. [Op. tom. iii. p. 262. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>i</sup> Cap. 13.



CHAP. ' should be ruined in case it go out of the body  
 XV. ' without the sacrament of Christian baptism, if it  
 288.  
 (A.D.388.) ' has neither committed any sin of its own, nor be  
 ' from that soul which first sinned in Adam.' [§. 22.]

The answer to that is<sup>k</sup> attempted to this purpose.

God puts the soul into an ill disposed body, that by ruling and keeping under the concupiscence thereof by the help of God's grace, it may procure the advantage of being, together with the body, changed into a better state at the resurrection than ever it could have had otherwise, viz. of living for ever with Christ. And to comply with the steps which the body makes by its gradual growth, the soul is at first possessed with a torpor, or incapacity of acting rationally; which does not do it much hurt, because it wears off by degrees as the body grows to perfection and the soul recovers from it, and arrives by God's help at a good degree of spiritual life. ' Now before the time that it can live ' according to the spirit, it has need of the sacrament ' of the Mediator, &c. For the punishment of original sin is taken away even in infancy by his ' sacrament; and without his help even a grown man ' will not keep under the concupiscence of the flesh, ' &c.—— And the infant must be baptized while ' he is alive: otherwise it will prove a prejudice to ' his soul that it was linked with sinful flesh; for ' the soul of an infant having participated with ' that, cannot be addicted to the things of the spirit: ' for that affection does weigh it down even after it ' is parted from the body, unless while it is in the ' body it be expiated by the one sacrifice of the true ' priest.' [§. 24, 25.]

<sup>k</sup> Cap. 14.

*Reply.* ‘But how,’ says one, ‘if the parents take  
 ‘no care to have this done, either through infidelity  
 ‘or negligence<sup>1</sup>?’

CHAP.  
 XV.  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.)

*Answer.* ‘That may be said as well of grown  
 ‘persons; for they may die suddenly, or they may  
 ‘fall sick in a place where nobody will help them to  
 ‘baptism.’

*Reply.* ‘But they have sins of their own that  
 ‘need forgiveness; and if they be not forgiven, a  
 ‘man cannot truly say they are punished unde-  
 ‘servedly for the things they have by their own  
 ‘will committed in their lifetime. But why shall  
 ‘that soul be deprived of eternal life (in case nobody  
 ‘help the infant to baptism) to which the contagion  
 ‘it has received from sinful flesh cannot be imputed,  
 ‘if it be not propagated from the first sinful soul?  
 ‘For it was placed in the body, not by any sin, but  
 ‘by nature that ordered it so, and by God that  
 ‘placed it there. And if we say that the want of  
 ‘baptism will do it no hurt, then what good does it  
 ‘do to one that is helped to it, if there be no hurt to  
 ‘one that is not helped?’ [§. 26.]

‘Here,’ says St. Austin, ‘I confess that I never  
 ‘heard or read what they can answer for their side,  
 ‘who endeavour to maintain by scripture (as being  
 ‘for their opinion, or as not being against it) that  
 ‘new souls, and not such as are derived from the  
 ‘parents, are put into bodies.’ [§. 27.]

Yet he attempts in the following chapters another  
 answer or two for those that held that opinion of  
 the new creation of souls, (for himself, it is plain  
 that he inclined most to the opinion of the propa-  
 gation of them; only he was so modest as not to

<sup>1</sup> Cap. 15.

CHAP. determine any thing ;) but they are long, and, as he  
 XV. shews, insufficient.

<sup>288.</sup>  
 (A.D. 388.) ‘ One is, that God does not, in his providence,  
 ‘ suffer any infant to die unbaptized, but such as he  
 ‘ foresaw would have been wicked and impenitent, if  
 ‘ they had lived. He shews how absurd it is to  
 ‘ think that God condemns persons for sins which  
 ‘ they never did, or thought of; only he foresees  
 ‘ they would have done them if they had lived.’

II. At last he comes to this end of his discourse on that subject. Having recited many arguments and answers on each side, he says<sup>m</sup>, ‘ Having treated  
 ‘ of this as largely as I could for the time, I should  
 ‘ judge the force of the reasons and of the authorities to be equal, or almost equal on both sides; were  
 ‘ it not that the opinion of those that think the souls  
 ‘ to be derived from the parents has the advantage  
 ‘ on the account of the baptism of infants; on which  
 ‘ point what answer can be given them, I do not at  
 ‘ present conceive. If God shall hereafter teach me  
 ‘ any thing, and shall grant me an opportunity to  
 ‘ write it, I shall not grudge it to those that are  
 ‘ studious of such things. But I now declare beforehand that the proof concerning infants must  
 ‘ not be disregarded, so as that if the truth be on the  
 ‘ other side, that should be passed over without answering. “ Aut enim de hac re nihil quærendum est,  
 ‘ ut sufficiat fidei nostræ scire nos quo pie vivendo  
 ‘ venturi sumus, etsi nesciamus unde venerimus :  
 ‘ Aut si non impudenter æstuat anima rationalis  
 ‘ etiam hoc nosse de seipsa; absit pervicacia contendendi, assit diligentia requirendi, humilitas  
 ‘ petendi, perseverantia pulsandi : Ut si nobis hoc



‘ expedire novit qui melius quam nos quid nobis CHAP.  
XV.  
 ‘ expediat utique novit, det etiam hoc qui dat bona  
 ‘ data filiis suis: Consuetudo tamen matris ecclesiæ 288.  
(A.D. 388.)  
 ‘ in baptizandis parvulis nequaquam spernenda est,  
 ‘ neque ullo modo superflua deputanda, nec omnino  
 ‘ credenda nisi apostolica esset<sup>n</sup> traditio.” [§. 39.]  
 ‘ For either nothing at all is to be inquired of this  
 ‘ matter [the origin of the soul], and it must suffice  
 ‘ our faith that we know whither we shall go, if we  
 ‘ live well, without knowing whence we are sprung:  
 ‘ or if it be no immodest ambition for a reasonable  
 ‘ soul to desire to know this also concerning herself;  
 ‘ putting away all obstinacy of contending, we must  
 ‘ use diligence in inquiring, humility in asking, per-  
 ‘ severance in knocking; that if he, who knows  
 ‘ better than we what is fit for us, do judge this ex-  
 ‘ pedient, he would grant this also, as he grants  
 ‘ good gifts to his children. But the custom of our  
 ‘ mother the church in baptizing infants must not  
 ‘ be disregarded, nor be accounted needless, nor be-  
 ‘ lieved to be other than a tradition [or order] of  
 ‘ the apostles.’

The late bishop of Worcester<sup>o</sup> has restored the true reading of this place out of three ancient manuscripts at Oxford: for in those last words, ‘ apo-  
 ‘ stolica esse traditio,’ the word *esse* was in the printed editions *esset*, which addition of one letter had wonderfully perverted the sense: for as it stood so, it was to be translated ‘ is not to be disregarded, nor to

<sup>n</sup> [The Benedictine Editors read *esset*; but see below Dr. Wall’s remarks on the point.]

<sup>o</sup> Bishop Stillingfleet; in a Rational Account of the Grounds of Protestant Religion, being a vindication of archbishop Laud’s Conference, pt. 1. ch. iv. §. 10. fol. London, 1665.

CHAP. XV. 'be accounted needless, nor to be believed at all, if  
 (A.D.<sup>288.</sup> 388.) 'it were not a tradition of the apostles.' Which makes St. Austin go forward and backward, and forward again in the same breath. But this amendment makes it a coherent sentence, agreeable to the scope of the place, and conformable to what St. Austin says in several other places: for example, it is the same phrase with that which I recited, sect. 4. §. 3. of this chapter, 'Non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum rectissime creditur,' 'is most reasonably believed to be no other than a thing delivered [or ordered] by the authority of the apostles.' So that though it was not fitting to alter the reading without the authority of some manuscripts, yet as soon as the alteration is proposed, it presently appears to be the true reading.

The papists made great use of this place as it stood so printed, to shew that some points of faith (for they make this difference about the time of baptism to concern a point of faith) can be proved only by tradition, and not by scripture, and consequently that the scripture is no complete rule of faith. Archbishop Laud managing the defence of the protestant doctrine to the contrary, says <sup>P</sup>, 'It is true Bellarmine presses a main place out of St. Austin, and he urges it hard;' meaning this place. But it might have been observed, even before the true reading was discovered, that the words so put together are nonsense. For if St. Austin had said, the doctrine of infant baptism were not to be believed if it were not a tradition of the apostles, it had been sense indeed, and something to their

<sup>P</sup> Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, §. 15. no. 5.

purpose, though not true. But to say ‘the custom of  
 ‘the church in baptizing infants were not to be  
 ‘believed unless it were a tradition of the apostles,’  
 is not sense; because the custom was seen and not  
 believed. Which is another proof that the print  
 was erroneous, and that the foresaid amendment is  
 the true reading.

The antipædobaptists on the contrary served themselves of this place to prove, as by St. Austin’s confession, that the practice of infant baptism depended only on tradition: from whence they concluded that it was not to be received at all. But whosoever reads these two passages of St. Austin that I have been comparing, will see, that he does not by the words *traditum* and *traditio*, mean a doctrine that had been taught by word of mouth only, and had no foundation in the written word. He plainly expresses the contrary in the former place: for he speaks to this purpose; if any one, beside the practice of the universal church, do require divine authority in this matter: first, that practice having not been ordered by any council, but having been ever in use in the church, it is most reasonable to believe that it must have been ordered by the apostles themselves. And, secondly, it may be proved from scripture also, by the analogy that baptism bears to circumcision, &c.

And whereas the Latin phrase runs, *Non nisi auctoritate apostolica traditum*; that does not signify that it was established no other way than by a verbal order; but that it came not in by any lesser or later authority than that of the apostles; not by any general council, &c.

It is true, his arguing in that place does suppose,



CHAP. XV. that though it could not have been proved from scripture, yet if it could be proved to have been ordered by the apostles by word in their life-time, that ought to have satisfied any one. And so no doubt it ought, provided the proof were clear. But this does not help the argument of the papists, who would have the consent of the church at present to be a sufficient proof of a doctrine. For how hard or how easy soever it was at that time for the church to know certainly the practice of the apostles, by a tradition which needed to be traced back but for three hundred years; it is utterly impossible now to trace back a tradition for 1600 years, unless it be recorded in scripture, or in those ancient writings nigh the time of the apostles: which, I am sure, the pope's supremacy and worship of images, &c. are not; whatever this that I am writing of be.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

Sect. 7. Out of St. Austin's letter to St. Hierome.

*Augustini Epist. 28.* [in edit. Benedict. 166.]

§. I. This letter was written after the Pelagian opinions began to be talked of. He mentions them there: 'For you are,' says he, 'none of those who now begin to prate new things, and say, there is no guilt derived from Adam, which is by baptism forgiven in an infant.' Therefore the quotations out of it ought not to be placed in this chapter, were it not that here they may be dispatched more briefly; as being exactly to the same purpose as those I last quoted.

St. Austin having, as we see, in his books on Genesis so treated of the origin of the soul, as to leave it in suspense how it is that we came by our souls; and being still thoughtful of that matter, and coming to know that St. Hierome had wrote

something on this subject in his Epistle to Marcellinus, and in a piece of his against Rufinus' Apology; wherein he had spoke in favour of that opinion which makes new souls to be created every day by God for every new infant, calling that ' the opinion of the church ;' and of the other opinion which supposes the soul to be propagated from the parent, had said, ' That it was the opinion of Tertullian and Apollinaris, and many of the western Christians, that as the body is generated of the body, so the soul is of the soul, and subsists in a way much like to that of brute creatures.' He had a mind to see how St. Hierome could free that opinion (which he seemed to embrace) of the new creation of souls, from the objection that lay against it from the propagation of original sin from father to son. And therefore he writes to him, though he lived above a thousand miles off, to desire him to explain that difficulty.

And for fear of provoking him, (for he was a hasty man, and St. Austin had felt the sharpness of his style in an angry fit before,) he writes in a most humble strain, and with great deference to his learning and judgment, condescending in his letter to such a degree, even of submission, as never was usual, and may seem indecent in a bishop writing to a presbyter, entreating him to instruct and satisfy him in such things as he was ignorant of, that he might be able to instruct others.

He first sets down some things which he knew of himself, that St. Hierome might have the less trouble in satisfying him of the other in which he was to seek. The things that he took for certain concerning the nature of man's soul were,

CHAP.  
XV.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

CHAP. 1. That the soul is immortal, and does not die  
 XV.  
 — when it goes out of the body. This he speaks of  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.) as a thing universally known, and agreed.

2. That it is not a part of God. Some philosophers had taught that. But it was rejected by all Christians, except some Priscillianists, Manichees, and I know not who.

3. That the soul is immaterial, he says, is a thing not easily to be proved to some people ; but for his part he is satisfied that it is. This, I suppose, he says, that he may not seem to come too near Tertullian, whom St. Hierome had mentioned, and who had held that not the soul only, but God also has a body.

4. That the soul is fallen into sin, not by any fault of God, not by any necessity either from God, or from its own primitive nature, but by its own will ; and that it cannot recover itself but by the grace of Jesus Christ. That there is in all mankind no soul but wants his redemption.

5. ‘That every soul that departs the body, at what age soever, without the grace of the Mediator, and the sacrament thereof, will be in punishment, and will at the last judgment receive its body to punishment : but if after the human generation, which is from Adam, it be regenerated in Christ, and belong to his communion ; it will have, after the death of the body, rest, and also will receive its body again to glory.

‘These are,’ says he, ‘things that I steadfastly believe concerning the soul. Now I entreat you, hear the things that I want to know ; and do not despise me, lest He despise you, who for our sakes vouchsafed to be despised.’



‘ Quæro, ubi contraxerit anima reatum, quo tra-  
 hitur in condemnationem, etiam infantis morte  
 præventi, si ei per sacramentum, quo etiam par-  
 vuli baptizantur, Christi gratia non subvenerit.’  
 [Cap. iii. §. 6.] ‘ I ask where the soul contracted  
 that guilt, by which it is brought to condem-  
 nation, (even the soul of an infant surprised  
 with death,) if the grace of Christ do not relieve  
 it by the sacrament whereby infants are bap-  
 tized.’

CHAP.  
XV.

288.  
(A.D. 388.)

In the process of the letter he takes for granted that St. Hierome’s opinion is, that a soul is new created for every infant; and says, ‘ I am very willing to be of that opinion too, but I am not as yet of it.—Therefore I entreat you, teach me what I shall teach, and hold, and tell me; if particular souls be made for every particular infant born, when it is that they do sin in the infant so as to need forgiveness, &c.—Since we must neither say of God, that he either forces the souls to become sinful, or punishes them being innocent; nor can deny that those souls even of infants which depart the body, without Christ’s sacrament, do go to any other than condemnation: I beseech you how can that opinion be defended, which holds that the souls do not come all of them from that one soul of the first man; but that as he had one made for him, so there is a particular one made for each infant.’ [Cap. iv. §. 10.]

He then recites some other objections that some people made against this opinion; as, that God rested the seventh day from making any new thing. And, that God, when he saw an infant begotten in whoredom, would never create a soul for that, &c.

CHAP. And he says, that he himself could easily answer all  
 XV. those objections ; and adds,

<sup>288.</sup>  
 (A.D. 388.) ‘ But when I come to the pains suffered by in-  
 ‘ fants, I am, I assure you, brought to great straits,  
 ‘ and cannot find any thing at all to answer: I  
 ‘ mean not only those pains, which after this life  
 ‘ do attend that condemnation to which they must  
 ‘ go, if they die without the sacrament of the Christ-  
 ‘ ian grace, but those which in this life we see  
 ‘ with our eyes, and it grieves us to see ; which if I  
 ‘ should go to count, I should sooner want time  
 ‘ than instances. They languish with sickness, they  
 ‘ are tortured with pains, they are afflicted with  
 ‘ hunger and thirst, maimed in their limbs, de-  
 ‘ prived of their senses, tormented with unclean  
 ‘ spirits.’ He afterwards asks, ‘ Whether we are  
 ‘ to think that as the herd of swine was given to  
 ‘ the devils to do their pleasure with them, so God  
 ‘ hath left infants to their will without a just  
 ‘ cause.’ [Cap. vi. sect. 16.]

Afterward, in trying every side of this argument, to see if there be any escaping the force of it, he speaks of the necessity there was to believe that infants cannot be saved without Christ, and that they have not the benefits of Christ consigned to them, but by baptism : and having mentioned that saying of the apostle, *As in Adam all die,—so in Christ shall all be quickened*, and some other texts, he says :

‘ And therefore whosoever shall tell us that any  
 ‘ one can be quickened in the resurrection of the  
 ‘ dead except by Christ, is to be abhorred as the  
 ‘ bane of our common faith. And whosoever shall  
 ‘ say that infants shall be quickened in Christ,

‘ which die without partaking of his sacrament, CHAP.  
 ‘ does both contradict the apostle’s preaching, and XV.  
 ‘ also *totam condemnat ecclesiam*, condemns the <sup>288.</sup>  
 ‘ whole church, in which men do hasten and run (A.D. 388.)  
 ‘ with their infants to be baptized, doubtless for  
 ‘ that reason, because they believe that otherwise  
 ‘ they cannot be quickened in Christ. And he that  
 ‘ is not quickened in Christ must remain in that  
 ‘ condemnation of which the apostle speaks, *By one*  
 ‘ *man’s offence judgment came on all to condemna-*  
 ‘ *tion*. To which condemnation that infants are  
 ‘ born liable, *et omnis credit ecclesia*, both all the  
 ‘ church believes, and you, in your books against  
 ‘ Jovinian, and in your Exposition on the Prophet  
 ‘ Jonah, have most orthodoxly proved, as I said be-  
 ‘ fore ; and I suppose in other places of your works,  
 ‘ which I have not read, or do not at present re-  
 ‘ member.’

‘ Now I would know what is the cause of this  
 ‘ condemnation. For if new souls be made for  
 ‘ every infant, I cannot see any sin of the souls at  
 ‘ that age, and I do not believe that God will condemn  
 ‘ any which he sees to have no sin.’ [Cap. vii.  
 §. 21.]

After another paragraph, in which he quotes a  
 passage out of the letter of St. Cyprian, which I  
 produced above<sup>q</sup>, he says, ‘ There must be a reason  
 ‘ given why souls, that are new created in all that  
 ‘ are born, are condemned ; for that they are con-  
 ‘ demned if they so die, both the holy scripture and  
 ‘ the holy church is witness. Therefore this opin-  
 ‘ ion of the creation of new souls, if it do not

<sup>q</sup> Ch. 6. §. 1.



CHAP. 'oppose this most established faith, shall be mine;  
XV. 'and if it do, do not let it be yours.' [§. 25.]

<sup>288.</sup>  
A.D. 388.) Then he shews the absurdity of those who answer all this by saying, that the soul sinned in some former state before it came into the body.

He concludes with protesting that he could wish that that opinion of St. Hierome might be shewn to be true: he liked it so well in other respects, were it not for this objection. He mentions his prayers to God that the doubt in which he was of this matter might, if it were God's will, be cleared to him by St. Hierome's means: but owns he must have patience if God refuse him this request. And of the several ways of clearing it, says,

'Antequam sciam, quænam earum potius eligenda sit, hoc me non temere sentire profiteor, eam quæ vera est non adversari robustissimæ ac fundatissimæ fidei, qua Christi ecclesia nec parvulos homines recentissime natos a damnatione credit, nisi per gratiam nominis Christi, quam in suis sacramentis commendavit, posse liberari.' [§. 28.]

'Before I know which of them is to be chosen, this I know; that that of them which is the true, does not oppose that most firm and established faith, by which the church of Christ believes that even the new born little ones of mankind cannot be freed from condemnation, but by the grace of the name of Christ, which he has commended to us in his sacraments.'

St. Hierome in his answer<sup>r</sup> to this letter did not think fit to enter upon a discussion of this question of the origin of the soul; but answered in short,

<sup>r</sup> Epist. 94.

that it was 'better for each to abound in his own  
'sense,' than by their disputes of this matter, to  
give advantage to their common enemies the Pela-  
gians, who said there was no original sin at all.  
'We,' says he, 'do indeed argue this matter for in-  
'struction's sake; but our adversaries, and espe-  
'cially the heretics, when they see us of different  
'opinions, will slander us as if we did it out of  
'envy.——Let us rather do our endeavour that  
'that most pernicious heresy may be extinguished,  
'which always pretends repentance, that it may  
'have opportunity of teaching in the church, lest if  
'it should declare itself openly, it should be expelled  
'from thence, and so die.'

And St. Austin, though he reckoned that in the  
other way of explaining the origin of the soul,  
which was embraced in the western church, viz.  
that it, as well as the body, is begotten by the pa-  
rents, it was much more easy to account for the  
guilt of original sin, yet never was positive. Neither  
did he publish this letter, as he says himself<sup>s</sup>, so  
long as St. Hierome lived: 'because if he had written  
'any answer, they might be better published toge-  
'ther. But when he was dead, I published it,' says  
he, 'that he that reads it may take advice, either  
'not to make any inquiry at all how the soul is  
'given to those that are born; or else in so very  
'obscure a matter to admit of such a solution of the  
'question as is not contrary to those plain points  
'which the catholic faith owns concerning infants,  
'that they will doubtless be condemned if they be  
'not regenerated in Christ.'

The opinion of St. Hierome, that the soul is by

<sup>s</sup> Retractation, lib. ii. cap. 45. [tom. i. p. 57. edit. Bened.]

CHAPTER XV. immediate creation, has since prevailed to be almost  
 the universal opinion in the west, as well as the  
 east.  
 (A.D.<sup>288.</sup>388.)

2. But the mechanic philosophy that is lately come in vogue has set some men upon an attempt to frame an hypothesis about the nature of the soul, which I cannot say is of St. Austin's side, because it carries the matter a great deal further than he would have it. It makes the soul not to be any thing really distinct from the body: but only such a disposition of the parts of the body, as makes it fit to live, move, remember, think, &c., all which they think may be done by a system of matter, provided there be skill enough in the contriver; and they refer us to the infinite art of God. So the old definition of Aristotle is come in request again, that it is nothing but *actus corporis organici*.

One may explain their meaning best by a thing that is more obviously apprehended. The disposition of the wheels in a clock, such as will make it go, may, for explication sake, be called the soul of the clock. And when the wheels are so rusty or broken that it will no longer go, the soul of it is gone; and a skilful artificer that can mend it, and make it go better than before, gives it a resurrection.

But there is in this sense no notion of a soul existing in a separate condition; and accordingly these men believe no such thing.

The antipædobaptists have been much inclined to an opinion of man's soul, that it either dies with the body, and has no existence; or falls asleep, as some term it, and has no sense till the resurrection. It is an opinion that took footing early among them



in Germany. For Calvin, in his work called *Psychopannychia*, written 1534, says<sup>t</sup>, ‘Some people in Arabia were the first authors of this opinion; who said the soul died with the body, and rose again at the day of judgment: and afterward John bishop of Rome held it; whom the school [or academy] of Paris forced to recant. And after it had been laid to sleep for some ages, it was lately revived by some of the anabaptist sort.’ And in his *Instructio adversus Anabaptistas*<sup>u</sup>, written 1544, he says, ‘They all commonly hold that souls separate from the body do sleep without any sense or understanding till the day of judgment: or, that the soul of a man is his life, which ceases when he dies, till he be raised again.’

Some of the antipædobaptists do still hold the same opinion, but not all.

It is a wonder how they, of all people, came to fall into this opinion. For since they do many of them deny original sin; the other opinion, which the generality of Christians do now embrace, (viz. that the soul of each infant is a spiritual substance, anew created by God, capable of existing without a body, but put by him into the body,) is much fitter for their purpose. For, as St. Austin here shews, the opinion of original sin derived to us all in our infancy from Adam our first parent, is much more easy to conceive on a supposal that we have nothing in us but what is propagated from the seed of Adam, than it is upon a supposal that God creates a soul out of nothing, which can subsist of itself, and puts it into the body for a time. For how

<sup>t</sup> In præfatione. [Calvini Opera, tom. viii. p. 335.]

<sup>u</sup> Art. 7. [Opera, tom. viii. p. 355.]

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.) comes that soul to have a guilt, derived to it from the sin of Adam, which has no succession at all from Adam, but is now lately created by God? It is indeed put into a body derived from Adam. But sin is of the soul rather than of the body. And besides, it was not its own fault or choice that it was put into a sinful body.

So that the pædobaptists and antipædobaptists, holding these opinions thus cross-wise, do make a controversy which in this particular looks something like a dispute<sup>x</sup> mentioned by St. Chrysostom, that was managed in his time between a Christian and a Greek; but so unskilfully, that he says, ‘the Greek said what the Christian should have said; and the Christian said what the Greek should have said.’

It is however a requisite property of sincerity, to declare and profess in any point what we think truest, though the other side do seem to suit better with our other tenets. The contrary is to serve, not the truth, but our hypothesis.

I am afraid we must all sit down in our disquisition concerning the origin of our souls, content with the comfort, with which St. Austin here supports himself; that we know, if we live well, whither we shall go after this state, without knowing how we came into it. For the explication that the schools have since added to this matter, with their *creando infunditur et infundendo creatur*, has put some new words into our mouths, but no new sense into our heads.

I shall here so far trespass upon the proposed

<sup>x</sup> In 1. ad Corinth. Hom. 3. [§. 4. p. 20. Op. tom. x.]

method of quoting the passages, wherein the Pelagians were concerned by themselves, as to rehearse here what St. Austin said a great while after on this subject. The Pelagians, in a letter which eighteen bishops of their party wrote and published by common consent, picked out several things that seemed absurd in the doctrine of the catholics; and among the rest, this: that they proved the propagation of sin by the propagation of souls, or held them as points that would stand or fall together. St. Austin, in his answer to that part of their letter says<sup>y</sup>:

CHAP.  
XV.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

‘ They add here, to cloud or confound the matter, an unnecessary question of the origin of souls: to the end that by disturbing things that are plain by the obscurity of other matters, they may seek an opportunity of lying hid. For they say that we maintain the propagation of sin together with the propagation of souls; which where or when they have heard in the speeches, or read in the books, of those that defend the catholic faith, I know not. For though I do meet with some things written by catholics on this subject; yet that was before the defence of the truth was undertaken against these men, and not in answer to any thing of theirs.

‘ But this I say, that original sin is so plain by the scriptures, and that it is forgiven to infants in the laver of regeneration, is so confirmed by the antiquity and authority of the catholic faith, so notorious by the practice of the church; that whatsoever is disputed, inquired, or affirmed of the origin of the soul, if it be contrary to this, cannot be true.’

<sup>y</sup> Lib. iii. contra duas Epist. Pelagian. cap. x. §. 26.



CHAP.  
XV.

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.)

This was his constant tenet, that though he inclined to one side of the question, concerning the origin of the soul, yet he would not have the doctrine of original sin to depend upon that.

III. There is one thing more observable from these two last passages of St. Austin, viz. that there was no such thing then used as private baptism of children in houses, except in cases of the greatest extremity; and that even sick children were carried to the church, if it were possible. For it is of such that he says, ‘men do hasten and run with them to be baptized while they are alive, lest when they are dead there be nothing to be done,’ &c. It was to the church that they ran, where there were large fonts or baptisteries, in which infants or grown persons might be put into the water. And it has since been decreed in a general council in Trullo, Can. 59, that baptisms shall not be in private chapels, but in the public church.

This was so generally observed from the time that churches were built, till of late days, that we read of many kings’ sons, and kings themselves, converted to the Christian faith, that received their baptism in the church. Whereas nowadays persons of much lower rank take the state upon them to expect it to be brought home to their children, though they are well. And there they put a great contempt upon it, by making it a formal ceremony, subservient to their bellycheer, and a drinking feast; little regard being given to the holy sacrament, or the prayers used thereat.

In cases of urgent extremity the ancients did indeed baptize any where; in the house, in the bed, &c., rather than the party should die without it. I

mean to give by and by<sup>z</sup> several proofs of that. But CHAP.  
XV.  
they never did so but in such cases.

The church of England allows of baptism by a 288.  
(A.D. 388.)  
minister in private houses in cases of necessity; but gives positive order, that it be not used except in case of danger of the child's death; and that such a child, if it live, be brought to the church, and his baptism declared there. And some bishops and curates of the said church do shew a zeal to have this order, which has of late been much neglected, put again in due execution. But others of them seem more indifferent about it. And in most places it is found a difficult thing to overcome that lazy and irreverent custom, which took such deep footing among the people in the late disorderly times.

There never was a more capricious change made by any sort of people in any matter of religion than the English presbyterians have made in this point. No longer ago than queen Elizabeth's time, they made it one of their objections against the English Common Prayer Book, that it gave any allowance for this private baptism at all. They pleaded, ' that ' it is not lawful either to preach the word, nor to ' minister the sacraments in private corners: that ' they ought not to be but where the church is; and ' that the church ought not to assemble (if it be not ' letted by persecution) but in open places: that ' John baptized openly: that Austin, although he ' were of that mind, that children could not be saved ' without baptism, yet in the time of necessity (as it ' is called) he does not allow either of baptism in ' private houses, or by women; but when there was

<sup>z</sup> Part ii. ch. 9. §. 2.

CHAP. 'danger, the women hasted to carry the children  
XV. 'unto the church.'

<sup>288.</sup>  
(A.D. 388.) These and more such like pleas, Cartwright used in his disputation with archbishop Whitgift. 'And 'so you see,' says he, 'those whom you charge 'slanderously with conventicles, are fain to glaze 'up the windows that you open to secret and private conventicles<sup>a</sup>.' And having mentioned 'the 'orders that God hath set, that it should be done 'in the congregation, and by the minister of the 'Gospel,' he adds this rigid and presbyterian expression; 'And I will further say, That although 'the infants which die without baptism, should 'be assuredly damned, (which is most false,) yet 'ought not the orders which God hath set in his 'church to be broken after this sort. For as the 'salvation of men ought to be dear unto us; so the 'glory of God, which consisteth in that his orders 'be kept, ought to be much more dear<sup>b</sup>.'

Whitgift, on the other side, shews that the book did not say any thing of baptism by women or by laymen; he pleads for no more than this, 'That 'upon extreme necessity of sickness, peril of death, 'and such like, the curate may be sent for, or some 'other minister that may sooner be come by,' to do it in the house. But he is not allowed that.

And yet how strangely have these men since ran into the other extreme! When they came to have the ordering of matters in the church, they (though contrary to the rules of their own Directory<sup>c</sup>)

<sup>a</sup> See Whitgift's Defence of the Answer to the Admonition, [fol. Lond. 1574.] Tract. ii. ch. 1. div. 8.

<sup>b</sup> [Id. ibid. Tract. ix. ch. 3, 4, 5.]

<sup>c</sup> The 'Directory for the publique worship of God throughout



gratified the humour of the people in this matter far more than ever the church of England had done. C H A P.  
XV.  
If their religion had been parliamentary, as the papists slander all our religion to be; they could not have taken a more violent swing from one side to the other. 288.  
(A.D. 388.)

At present they and their people make this house-baptism the most ordinary way of administering that sacrament, be the child sick or well: and in London and other places, where any of them are, a clergyman of the church of England cannot, if he would, bring his people to the observation of the foresaid order of the church; because if any humoursome man or woman of his parish have a mind to have their child, though in never so good health, baptized in the house, and he deny them; the next thing is, they in a pet send for one of these men, who are always ready to do it.

There are no orders of the church that do come in process of time to be more grossly and universally abused, than those that begin first to be dispensed with for the state and character of the persons concerned in them. This was first granted as a privilege of kings, or kings' sons, as appears by the decretals<sup>d</sup> of Clement the fifth; and by the

' the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, together  
' with an ordinance of parliament, for the taking away of the  
' book of Common Prayer,' a work published by authority, in  
the year 1644, gives the following orders respecting baptism:  
' Nor is it to be administered in private places, or privately, but  
' in the place of public worship, and in the face of the 'con-  
' gregation, where the people may most conveniently see and  
' hear.' p. 39, edit. 4to. 1644.]

<sup>d</sup> [See Decretal. Clementin. lib. iii. tit. 15. de Baptismo. The words of the text are, 'nisi regum vel principum liberi extite-

CHAP. council of Cologne, where it is ordained that none  
 XV. but they should be baptized at home. Afterward  
 288.  
 (A.D. 388.) it came, I suppose, to be allowed to noblemen, and  
 1310. so to other rich men. And as everybody affects  
 the name and state of gentility; they think them-  
 selves hardly dealt with, if they be accounted in  
 this matter inferior to such or such of their neigh-  
 bours.

This, and many other instances of like nature  
 that might be given, should teach the clergy to take  
 care how they make any beginning of breaking  
 that rule of scripture given by St. James <sup>e</sup> against  
 any respect of persons to be shewn in church mat-  
 ters; for if you once begin, there is no stop to be  
 made afterward. Therefore the synod of Aix de-  
 1485. termined, ‘That no curate or other priest should,  
 ‘ under pain of excommunication, go to any house,  
 ‘ not even of a nobleman, to administer baptism,  
 ‘ except in case of necessity; and that no case should  
 ‘ be taken to be of necessity, but when the child’s  
 ‘ life is in danger <sup>f</sup>.’

## CHAP. XVI.

*Quotations out of some Councils of Carthage, before the  
 Pelagian Controversy.*

297.  
 (A.D. 397.) §. 1. THE most ancient councils of Carthage, as  
 well as of other churches, are not recorded in the

‘rint,’ where follows a long and most puerile gloss upon the  
 word *princeps*, shewing that it might mean *God*, an *angel*, the  
*pope*, a *lord mayor*, a *bee*, a *bird*, or the *devil*.]

<sup>e</sup> Chap ii. 1, 2, 3.

<sup>f</sup> Laurentii Bochelli Decreta Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ [fol. Paris,  
 1609: again, *ibid.* 1621. Lib. ii. tit. 3. de Baptismo, cap. 77.]

volumes of councils. The custom of registering the acts of councils, and bringing them into volumes, began later. One of the first of all the councils of Carthage, and (except one or two) of the most ancient in all Christendom, since the times of the apostles, of which we have any remains, was that of sixty-six bishops under St. Cyprian in the year after the apostles 150; which resolved the question whether infant-baptism might be administered on the first or second day after the birth, or must be deferred till the eighth. But the account of that is given before at large in chap. vi. Those that I mean to recite here are of such as are set down in the common volumes, and were about the latter end of the fourth century.

CHAP.  
XVI.

<sup>297.</sup>  
(A.D. 397.)

And of these Dr. Cave <sup>g</sup> and others have observed, that there is great obscurity and difficulty in assigning the very year on which they were held; and some confusion by reason of the carelessness or mistakes of the collectors, who have sometimes inserted into one council some of the canons that have been made in another. I shall not in these nice matters pretend to be wiser than other men. But the first canon that I shall quote, carries in itself a plain and undoubted indication of the year in which it was enacted.

It is the forty-eighth canon of that council of Carthage which is generally called the third. About the time when this council was held, the schism of the Donatists began to break apace; and those who had been brought up in it came over in great

<sup>g</sup> *Historia Literaria*, part ii. p. 132. [Tom. i. p. 369, edit. Oxon, 1740.]



CHAP. numbers to the communion of the church. This  
 XVI. party of men, as I shewed before<sup>h</sup>, differed no-  
 (A.D.<sup>297.</sup>397.) thing from the catholics in any point either of doc-  
 trine or of ceremonies, or of sacraments; but only  
 they accounted that party in Africa which was  
 called the catholic church, impure by reason of some  
 ill men that were among them, or by reason that  
 some of the ministers thereof derived their ordina-  
 tion from bishops that had, as was said, been guilty  
 of apostasy in the former times of persecution: and  
 all that came over to them from the catholics they  
 had been wont to baptize anew, as coming out of  
 an impure church.

Now the bishops of this council debated among  
 themselves how far it was expedient to admit any  
 that returned from this schism to the church, into  
 holy orders. And as for those who having been  
 once baptized in the catholic church, did, after they  
 came to years, revolt to the Donatists, and were  
 baptized by them; they agreed that such, upon  
 their return to the church, might be admitted to  
 lay-communion, but never to bear any office in the  
 church. But the case of those that had been born  
 among the Donatists, and had been in their infancy  
 baptized by them, and after they came to years of  
 discretion disliked the schism and came over to the  
 church, seemed very different.

Concerning these they could not come to any re-  
 solution at the present: and therefore they agreed  
 that the advice of two of the most noted neighbour-  
 ing churches should be asked in that matter; and  
 they made a canon in these words:

<sup>h</sup> Ch. ix.

*Concilii Carthag. tertii* Can. 48. [tom. ii. p. 1072, CHAP. XVI.  
1177, edit. Labbe, tom. iii. p. 892. edit. Mansi.]

‘ De Donatistis, placuit ut consulamus fratres et <sup>297.</sup> (A.D. 397.)  
‘ consacerdotes nostros Siricium et Simplicianum, de  
‘ solis infantibus qui baptizantur penes eosdem, ne  
‘ [leg. an] quod suo non fecerunt iudicio, cum ad  
‘ ecclesiam Dei salubri proposito fuerint conversi,  
‘ parentum illos error impediat, ne provehantur sacri  
‘ altaris ministri.’

‘ In reference to the Donatists, it is resolved that  
‘ we do ask the advice of our brethen and fellow  
‘ bishops Siricius and Simplicianus, concerning those  
‘ only who are in infancy baptized among them;  
‘ whether in that which they have not done by their  
‘ own judgment, the error of their parents shall  
‘ hinder them, that when they by a wholesome pur-  
‘ pose shall be converted to the church of God, they  
‘ may not be promoted to be ministers of the holy  
‘ altar.’

The collection that is called *Concilium Africanum*, has this same canon, *capitulo* 14. Siricius was at this time bishop of Rome, and Simplicianus of Milan. So that, as I said, this canon gives us from itself a clear proof of the year when it was made, <sup>297.</sup> viz. anno Dom. 397. for Simplicianus was not made bishop of Milan, till the beginning of this year, when he came into the room of St. Ambrose, who died then: and in the beginning of the next year Siricius bishop of Rome died.

II. The answer of these two bishops seems to have been in favour of those concerning whom their opinion was asked; for four years after, the council <sub>301.</sub> of Carthage determines the point absolutely, that such persons may, if there be occasion, be promoted

CHAP. to the ministry. The canon, leaving out the digres-  
XVI. sions, is this :

<sup>297.</sup>  
(A.D. 397.) *Codex Canonum Ecclesiæ Africanæ*, Can. 57. [see  
Concil. edit. Binii, tom. i. p. 636.—edit. Reg.  
Paris. tom. iv. p. 528. et iterum, p. 598.—tom. ii.  
p. 1084. ed. Labb.]

Aurelius bishop of Carthage speaks in the council,  
and says,

‘ Superiori concilio statutum esse mecum recog-  
‘ noscit unanimitas vestra, ut hi qui apud Donatistas  
‘ parvuli baptizati sunt, nondum scire valentes er-  
‘ roris eorum interitum, et posteaquam ad ætatem  
‘ rationis capacem pervenerunt, agnita veritate, &c.  
‘ ———recepti sunt;———sine dubio ad officium  
‘ clericatus tales esse applicandos, et maxime in  
‘ tanta rerum necessitate, nullus est qui non con-  
‘ cedat.

‘ Quanquam nonnulli ejusdem sectæ clerici, cum  
‘ plebibus atque honoribus suis ad nos transire desi-  
‘ derent, &c.——Sed hoc majori fratrum supradic-  
‘ torum considerationi dimittendum censeo.——Tan-  
‘ tum de his qui infantes baptizati sunt satagimus,  
‘ ut nostræ, si placet, in iisdem ordinandis consen-  
‘ tiant voluntati,’ &c.

‘ You remember that in a former council it was  
‘ resolved, that they who were, in their infancy, be-  
‘ fore they were able to understand the mischief of  
‘ that error, baptized among the Donatists, and when  
‘ they came to age of understanding, acknowledging  
‘ the truth, &c.——they were received by us.——  
‘ All will grant that such may undoubtedly be pro-  
‘ moted to church offices, especially in times of so  
‘ great need.

‘ Some that have been teachers in that sect would



‘ come over with their congregations, if they might  
 ‘ have the same places among us, &c.——But this I  
 ‘ leave to a further consideration of our brethren,  
 ‘ &c.——Only that they will consent to our deter-  
 ‘ mination, that such as were baptized by them in  
 ‘ infancy, may be admitted to orders.’

C H A P.  
 XVI.  
 300.  
 (A.D. 400.)

This shews plainly that the Donatists as well as Catholics baptized in infancy: only those that had been baptized by the church party, whether in infancy, or at full age, they would not receive into their sect without giving them a new baptism; because they judged baptism given in an impure church was void, though it were given in the right form, and to a subject never so capable: for which the church charged them with the crime of anabaptism, or rebaptization. And they were about this time reduced, and came over to the church.

III. There are added in the old copies of the said third council of Carthage, anno Dom. 397, some canons, of which it is said, ‘ it is not certain whether  
 ‘ they belong properly to the first, or second, or  
 ‘ third council.’ One of them<sup>i</sup> is for abating to poor people the fees that were usually paid to the minister at the baptizing of a child. But it being accounted by the most learned critics to be of a later date, and to have been crowded in here by Mercator, I shall omit the recital of it.

IV. The next of the councils of Carthage, in which we find any mention of infant-baptism, is that which is vulgarly called the fifth, and was celebrated three years after, viz. anno Dom. 400. In

<sup>i</sup> Labbei Concil. [see this canon, in tom. iii. p. 511. Collect. Reg. Paris.—tom. iii. p. 892. edit. Mansi.] Item, Carranza summa Concil. Concil. Carthag. Tertium; Item Gratian. q. 1.

CHAP.  
XVI.

<sup>300.</sup>  
(A.D. 400.)

which there is a canon that makes provision for the case of such as had been carried away captive in their infancy, into the country of the barbarians, and when they were ransomed, there was none of their friends left alive that could certainly tell whether they had been baptized before their carrying away or not. Such persons, or their surviving friends for them, were in great perplexity and doubt whether it were fit that they should be baptized after their ransom. For if they were baptized before their captivity, then this would be to baptize them twice; which was looked on by all Christians, except the Marcionites, to be a great profanation of the sacrament. And if they were not baptized before; then not to do it now, were to let them die without any baptism at all. The words of the canon are these:

*Concilii Carthaginienſis Quinti, Canon 6.<sup>k</sup>*

‘ Placuit de infantibus, quoties non inveniuntur  
‘ certissimi testes, qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubi-  
‘ tatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt per ætatem idonei  
‘ de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere; absque  
‘ ullo scrupulo hos esse baptizandos: ne ista trepi-  
‘ datio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari.  
‘ Hinc enim legati Maurorum fratres nostri consu-  
‘ luerunt,’ &c.

‘ It is resolved concerning infants of whose having  
‘ been baptized there are no positive witnesses that  
‘ can give certain evidence, and they themselves are  
‘ not capable to give any account of that sacrament  
‘ having been administered to them, by reason of  
‘ their age; that such be without any scruple bap-

<sup>k</sup> [See Binii edit. tom. i. p. 637. Collect. reg. Paris. tom. iv. p. 536, et 609.—edit. Mansi, tom. iii. pp. 926 et 969.]

‘tized: lest that scruple do cause them to go with-  
 ‘out the cleansing of the sacrament. For our bre-  
 ‘thren that come from the Mauritanians have asked  
 ‘our advice on this question, who do ransom many  
 ‘such from the barbarians,’ &c.

CHAP.  
 XVI.

<sup>300.</sup>  
 (A.D. 400.)

I set this council at anno 400, that is, the year after the apostles 300. And so do all late writers that speak of it set it then, or within a year or two of that time. Which I note, because Binius and some other old copies give it a date that may seem at first sight very absurd and inconsistent, worded thus, ‘Circa tempora Anastasii Papæ post consula-  
 ‘tum Cæsarii et Attici, sexto kalendas Junii habi-  
 ‘tum, æra 438.’ ‘Held about the time of pope  
 ‘Anastasius, after the consulship of Cæsarius and  
 ‘Atticus, six days before the kalends of June, in the  
 ‘year 438.’ But the consulship of Cæsarius and Atticus was in the year 397. And Anastasius came into the see anno 398, and lived but four years. And Aurelius, whose name is among the bishops that subscribed this council, could not live to 438. But all this is reconciled by taking that æra 438 not for the year of Christ, but for the year of that æra which the Spaniards call *æra Augusti*, reckoned from the time of the senate’s confirming the acts of the triumvirate, which was (as Petavius, Rat. Temp. pt. ii. cap. 3. shews) just thirty-eight years before the Christian æra. So that this, instead of disturbing, does confirm the date of anno Dom. 400.

So that Baronius, Spondanus, Dr. Cave, &c., place it anno 398. Justellus and cardinal Perron, anno 401. Schelstratius, this year 400. All in the time of Anastasius. And another thing which confirms



CHAP. its being on one of these years, is the matter of the  
 XVI. last canon of it : and yet the different understanding  
 (A.D.<sup>300.</sup>400.) of some words of that canon causes the difference in  
 placing it of a year or two. The canon is this ; ‘ Re-  
 ‘ solved, that a petition be made to the most renown-  
 ‘ ed emperors, that all relics of idolatry, not only in  
 ‘ images, but in all places, whether groves or trees,  
 ‘ be altogether destroyed.’

Now all agree, that on the year 399 was the most general overthrow of the heathen temples, in all the empire, but especially at Carthage, and in all Africa. St. Austin gives<sup>1</sup> the account of it, which is very remarkable.

The heathens had had a tradition very rife among them, that the Christian religion should last but 365 years, to be reckoned from the beginning of it. They depended upon an oracle for this. The oracle had said, that Peter the apostle being a skilful magician, had, by killing and cutting in pieces a child of a year old, and burying the limbs of it with certain magical rites, raised so strong a charm for the success of the Christian religion, that it must now last for so many years as the child was days old : but when that time was expired they should see it presently come to an end. And one may perceive by St. Austin’s words, that the heathens at that time expected the extirpation of Christianity as confidently as the papists do now the extirpation of the northern heresy.

St. Austin allows them the latest time they could suppose for the beginning of Christian religion, viz. the Pentecost that was next after Christ’s death. He

<sup>1</sup> De Civitate Dei, lib. xviii. cap. 53, 54.

shews that 365 years, reckoned from that Pentecost, do end in the consulship of Honorius and Euty-  
CHAP.  
XVI.  
chianus, which is in our way of reckoning, the year 398. ‘ Now,’ says he, ‘ the next year to that being <sup>300.</sup>  
(A.D.400.)  
‘ the consulship of Honorius and Manlius Theodorus,  
‘ when, according to that oracle of devils, or figment  
‘ of men, there should have been no such thing as  
‘ Christian religion in the world, what was done in  
‘ other countries I had not occasion to inquire ; but  
‘ this I know, that in Carthage, the most noted and  
‘ eminent city of all Africa, Gaudentius and Jovius,  
‘ the emperor Honorius’ lieutenants, did, on the 19th  
‘ of March, pull down the temples of the false gods,  
‘ and break in pieces their idols. From which time  
‘ to this present, being almost thirty years, who  
‘ does not see how much the worship of Christ’s  
‘ name has increased? Especially since many of  
‘ those are become Christians, who were before kept  
‘ back from the faith, by that prophecy, which, now  
‘ the time is past, they perceive to have been a  
‘ foolish and idle one.’

Baronius thinks that this order of Honorius, for razing the heathen temples, was given by him in compliance with that petition made by this council of Carthage ; and if so, the razing being anno 399, the council must have been the year before. But others think that the style of the petition supposes the temples and such public places of idolatry at Carthage to be destroyed already ; and that the bishops desire the emperor to complete that good work, by extirpating all the remains of idolatry practised with images placed in groves, trees, &c.

This latter seems the more probable by the words of the petition. So the council may be supposed to

CHAP. be the year after the emperor's first order, viz.  
 XVI. *anno Christi 400* ; but however it appears to have  
 300.  
 (A.D. 400.) been about this time.

V. There had been, as it seems in some council at Hippo before that time, a resolution to the same  
 290. purpose, viz. that those who had no certain proof of their baptism in infancy, should be, for certainty, baptized now. For there is in Labbe's Collection<sup>n</sup>, and in the Magdeburgenses<sup>o</sup> at the year 397, set down a copy of a synodical letter dated *Cæsario et Attico Coss.* wherein they complain, 'that those  
 ' things which had been long ago enacted in the  
 ' council of Hippo had not been so duly put in execution as they ought.' They enjoin better execution of them for the future, and to that purpose give a breviat of them, being forty-one in number: the fortieth of which is given thus, 'De his qui in  
 ' nullo testimonio se baptizatos noverunt, ut baptizentur.' 'For those that are not sure by any evidence that they have been baptized, that they be  
 ' now baptized.'

340. VI. It was not long after these times that Leo the first, bishop of Rome, had occasion to consider of the same case in a synod at Rome ; and he has left an epistle on that subject : which, though it be something later than the period of time which I have proposed to search, Leo being made bishop of that see in the year of Christ 440, yet it being so particularly relating to this matter, I shall here transcribe so much of it as is to this purpose. It is directed to

<sup>n</sup> [Collect. Reg. Paris. tom. iii. p. 513. Labb. ii. p. 1179. Mansi, iii. p. 893.]

<sup>o</sup> Cent. iv. cap. 9. de Synodis, p. 866.



Neon, bishop of Ravenna, and is the 37th<sup>p</sup> among his epistles. C H A P.  
XVI.

‘ We have been given to understand by the relation of some brethren, that several captives, who were carried into captivity at that age which has no firm knowledge of any thing, do, now they are restored to their liberty and their home, desire the remedy of baptism. But by reason of the ignorance of their infancy, they cannot remember whether or no they have received the sacrament of that mystery before. And that by reason of this uncertain state of remembrance, their souls are brought into danger; for that under pretence of caution the grace is denied them, *Quæ ideo non impenditur quia putatur impensa*, being therefore not given them, because it is supposed that they have had it already. 340.  
(A.D. 440.)

‘ When therefore the scrupulousness of some brethren did, not without cause, make a doubt of administering to such persons the sacrament of our Lord’s mystery; we did, as I said, at a synodical meeting take this sort of case into our consideration, and set ourselves to discuss the point with a careful diligence, according to the opinion of every one: that by the judgment of many considering the matter together, we might more certainly fix on the truth. And that which by God’s guidance came into my mind, the numerous consent of the brethren confirmed.

‘ We ought then, above all things, to beware that while we shew a sort of caution, we do not fall

q [Viz. in Labbe and the older collections: the 135th in Quesnel’s edition of Leo’s works, 1675; or the 166th in Mansi’s edition of the Councils, tom. vi. p. 387.]

CHAP. XVI. ' into a failure of regenerating their souls. For who  
 (A.D. 440.) ' would be so addicted to his suspicions, as to define  
 ' a thing to be true, which without any full proof,  
 ' he by an uncertain opinion surmises to be so ?  
 ' therefore when as neither he that desires the rege-  
 ' neration does remember that he was ever baptized,  
 ' nor any one else can testify of his consecration [or,  
 ' sanctification], there is no reason to think there is  
 ' any sin in doing this, when neither he that is con-  
 ' secrated, nor he that consecrates him, acts any  
 ' thing against his knowledge [or, conscience].

' I know indeed that it is an inexcusable fault,  
 ' when, according to the fashion of the heretics,  
 ' which is condemned by the holy fathers, any one  
 ' is compelled to reiterate his baptism, which is once  
 ' for all given to those that are to be regenerated :  
 ' the apostolic doctrine being against such a prac-  
 ' tice, and teaching us that there is but one Godhead  
 ' in the Trinity, one confession in the faith, and one  
 ' sacrament of baptism. But there is nothing like  
 ' that to be feared in this case ; for that cannot be  
 ' brought within compass of the crime of reitera-  
 ' tion, of which we are not sure that it has been  
 ' done once.

' And therefore when any such case comes before  
 ' you, first examine the matter narrowly ; and con-  
 ' tinue your search for a great while (unless the  
 ' party seems to be nigh his end), whether there be  
 ' nobody at all to be found that can help out the  
 ' ignorance of such a person that knows not his own  
 ' condition. And if it appear, that he that wants  
 ' the sacrament is kept off only by a vain surmise,  
 ' let him come without fear to the obtaining of the  
 ' grace, of which he does not find any evidence that

‘ he has had it before. And let us not be afraid to  
 ‘ open the gate of salvation to him who cannot be  
 ‘ proved as yet to have entered into it.

CHAP.  
XVI.

<sup>340.</sup>  
(A.D.440.)

‘ But if it can be proved that any such person  
 ‘ has been baptized, though by the heretics; let  
 ‘ the sacrament of regeneration be by no means  
 ‘ reiterated on him: but let that only which was  
 ‘ wanting there, be now added; that he have the  
 ‘ imposition of hands by the bishop, for the ob-  
 ‘ taining the grace of the Holy Spirit.

‘ These things, dear brother, I was willing should  
 ‘ come to the knowledge of you all; lest, while you  
 ‘ allow too much to your scruples, the mercy of God  
 ‘ be denied to those that desire to be saved.

‘ Dated the ninth before the kalends of November,  
 ‘ in the consulship of Marcian<sup>p</sup> the emperor.’

The same question being put to him by Rusticus,  
 bishop of Narbon, he resolves it to the same effect<sup>q</sup>;  
 and so does Gregory the Great, in the next age<sup>r</sup>;  
 and so does the council in Trullo, Can. 84. anno <sup>490.</sup><sub>591.</sub>  
 691.

The heretics that Leo talks of, as reiterating  
 baptism, were either the Marcionites, who gave to  
 some people a second or third baptism, though they  
 owned the first to have been true baptism; or else  
 the Donatists, who thinking no baptism to be true,  
 that was not given by such holy and pure men as  
 themselves, gave a new baptism to all that came  
 from any other party to theirs.

<sup>p</sup> [Or *Majorianus*: see the notes of Quesnel, and of Mansi on  
 the place.]

<sup>q</sup> Ep. 92. cap. 16. [Ep. 2. edit. Quesnel: 167. edit. Concil.  
 Mansi.]

<sup>r</sup> Lib. xii. Ep. 31.



CHAP.  
XVI.

---

<sup>340.</sup>  
(A.D. 440.)

The church of England is very careful, as not to let any one go without baptism, so also not to baptize again those that have been baptized already. And therefore when any person is brought to baptism, concerning whom they cannot be sure whether he is already baptized or not, they order him to be baptized with these conditional words preceding the form of baptism, ‘ If thou art not already baptized, ‘ *N.* I baptize thee in the name,’ &c.

1059. It had been usual to do so for many hundred years before<sup>s</sup>. But Luther found great fault with this custom ; and Vossius dislikes it, but gives no other reason against it than that there is no example of such conditional baptism in scripture, nor in the records of the first ages. Which in a case that so seldom happens, is no wonder ; for in the church of England, where it is appointed in a certain case, yet that case being rare, very few have ever had occasion to practise it. But it is certain that all that do baptize in such a case, do understand that condition, though they do not express it ; for they do it on a supposal that the party is not baptized already.

The next council of Carthage that I know of, that had any occasion to mention infant-baptism, 311. was that anno 411, or the beginning of 412, where Cælestius was challenged for denying original sin, and thought to escape the brand of heresy by declaring, that whatever he thought of sin in infants, yet he owned their baptism. This council is not in the volumes, but St. Austin has preserved some of the

<sup>s</sup> Vide Vossium de Baptismo, Disp. 15. Art. 11. et lib. vi. capit. Caroli Magni.

acts of it, by quoting them in his writings<sup>t</sup>; and I had occasion to recite out of him what is material to this purpose, in a chapter<sup>u</sup> before.

CHAP.  
XVI.  
340.  
(A.D. 440.)

And the next to that was that anno 416. A synodical letter whereof I shall recite hereafter<sup>x</sup>.

## CHAP. XVII.

*Out of the Decretal Epistles of Siricius and Innocentius, Bishops of Rome.*

§. 1. THERE never was a greater cheat and abuse put upon the church and the learned world, than that piece of forgery of the most ancient Decretal Epistles. The papists themselves are now ashamed to hear them mentioned, except some few, whose want of all shame makes amends for their want of learning.

284.  
(A.D. 384.)

The history of them in short is this: the ancient bishops of Rome were frequently consulted by the country bishops, and the bishops of the neighbouring churches, in cases of conscience, faith, or discipline. They wrote letters in answer to such questions as were put to them. Toward the latter end of the fourth century there began a custom of registering and preserving these letters in the archives of that church. This was in the following times found to be of great use; for these letters served the succeeding bishops for precedents, when their judgment was desired in the like cases.

<sup>t</sup> [See all which is remaining, in Mansi's edition of the councils, tom. iv. p. 290.]

<sup>u</sup> Ch. v. §. 8.

<sup>x</sup> Ch. xix. §. 28.

CHAP.  
XVII.  
—  
<sup>284.</sup>  
(A.D. 384.)

After many ages it came into the mind of some of that church, to think how great pity it was that that custom of registering those letters had not begun sooner, for there were none extant in the registers that were earlier than about the time I mentioned.

The way that they took to make up that deficiency was such, as that the mention thereof must make a Christian blush, whenever the credit of his religion is attacked by a heathen. Some among them, that had no regard to true or false, put in practice that foul artifice that is used by faithless and fabulous historians; who, when they would set forth the antiquities of their nation, and find no records nor race of kings so ancient as they could wish, do make out of their own brain histories of times, names of kings, accounts of wars and successions, as far back as they please to feign. Of which we see instances in the fabulous histories of the Romans, Britons, Scots, Egyptians, Chinese, &c. This is scandalous and hateful enough in secular histories; but in the concerns of religion, is the highest pitch of impiety and mischief.

Finding that their bishops of the first ages had none of these decretal epistles upon record, as many of the following ones had, they made some for them, and put them out under their names. And as there was a very corrupt state of that church at the time when these acts were forged, the authors of them failed not to make the ancient popes say all that they had a mind they should have said. So that you shall there frequently find some bishop of Rome of the primitive times, who was in reality an humble, poor, and persecuted bishop, strutting and va-



pouring about the supremacy of his see, and enacting many things that were really never heard in his time.

CHAP.  
XVII.

<sup>284.</sup>  
(A.D. 384.)

When any thing is discovered and made plain, we are apt to wonder that it was not discovered sooner. It was a time of great ignorance and barbarity, when these forged epistles were put upon the world. And in the beginning of the reformation, the protestants were much puzzled with them. They saw plain enough that the corrupt doctrines and practices then received had no foundation in the scripture, nor in the writings of the ancient Christians for several ages; but they knew not what to say to these epistles, many of which were dated in and nigh the times of the apostles, and yet had in them rank popery. Those first bishops of all, Clement, Anaclet, Evarest, Alexander, Xystus, and the holy martyr Telesphorus, &c., did there all speak the language of Gregory the VIIth.

It is true that here and there one of the best learned and most free men among the papists themselves had before that time declared their objections against some of these epistles. For example, cardinal Cusanus, after he had shewn by plain proofs that the charter of Constantine's donation was a forgery, adds, 'As perhaps are some other of the <sup>1334.</sup> large writings attributed to St. Clement and Anaclet. For the letters themselves, examined by the circumstances of the times of those men, do bewray themselves.' But these exceptions of one or two men availed nothing against the general vote; they were universally received, the canonists

y Nicolaus de Cusa Cardinalis, de Concordantia Catholica, lib. iii. c. 2. [p. 782. edit. Basil. 1565.]

CHAP. made constant use of them, and the canon law of  
XVII. that time was in great measure made out of them.

<sup>284.</sup>  
(A.D. 384.) Wickliffe ventured to say that they were apocryphal, [or spurious,] and that the clergy were fools to study them. Which is reckoned for the thirty-eighth of the forty-five heresies, for which he was condemned by the council of Constance.

<sup>1417.</sup> Luther exclaimed against them after his way, and caused them and the whole body of the decretals to be publicly burnt; but he had not learning enough to trace and descry the forgery of them. But bi-  
<sup>1456.</sup>shop Jewel, being to answer his adversary Harding, who had pressed him with authorities out of them, made use of his skill in ecclesiastical history to disclose plain proofs of forgery in several of them. And the critics since, both those of the Romish and reformed church, have, by a particular examination, put it out of doubt that all of them, beyond the times I spoke of, are spurious.

They are never mentioned by any writer of any antiquity; they are written, not in the style that was in use in the time of the Roman empire, but in that of the barbarous age. The dates of almost all of them are inconsistent with history. The ignorant forger has made most of them speak of men and things, customs and forms, that were not in being at that time. Beside, that each epistle has in itself some particular proof of its being forged.

II. Now that which the critics and learned men are agreed on is, that the epistles of pope Siricius, who was made bishop anno 384, are the first of all the decretal epistles that are genuine, i. e. that were really written by the men whose names they bear. It is true that there are epistles

extant, one of Clement, out of which I gave a quotation, ch. i. §. 1. and some of Cornelius, and one or two more, which are undoubted, and are mentioned and valued by all the ancients: but the forger of the decretals took no notice of them; either because they were nothing for his turn, or perhaps he was so ignorant as not to know of them. Those which he has made, are of more use to the design of the court of Rome, but otherwise of no worth.

CHAP.  
XVII.

<sup>284.</sup>  
(A.D. 384.)

But indeed the church of Rome affords in all but a very few writers of any antiquity. And if she be the mother, she was in those times outdone by many of her daughters for number of learned men. Since Clement and Hermas, who lived in the apostles' time, and St. Hierome, who had his education in that church, there has been none that I have had occasion to mention in this tract till this Siricius.

III. He has several epistles extant, that are genuine, and are mentioned by writers so ancient and so learned as not to be imposed on by the forementioned forgery. And the marks of popish worship that are so frequent in the elder forged epistles, are all vanished again in those of Siricius and Innocent, and of several popes that succeeded them. That which I have occasion to quote is the first of them, which is written to Himerius, bishop of Arragon in Spain.

He gives him several directions about ecclesiastical matters, and finds fault with many things that by his information he understood to be managed disorderly in that church. It is divided into fifteen chapters, or paragraphs; whereof the second is this:



CHAP. *Siricii Episcopi Decretalis Epistola prima. Ca-*  
 XVII. *pitulo secundo*<sup>z</sup>.

<sup>284.</sup>  
 (A.D.384.)

‘ Sequitur de diversis baptizandorum temporibus,  
 ‘ prout unicuique libitum fuerit, improbabilis et  
 ‘ emendanda confusio; quæ a nostris consacerdoti-  
 ‘ bus (quod commoti dicimus) non ratione auctori-  
 ‘ tis alicujus, sed sola temeritate præsumitur: ut  
 ‘ passim ac libere natalitiis Christi, seu apparitionis,  
 ‘ nec non et apostolorum seu martyrum festivita-  
 ‘ tibus, innumeræ (ut asseris) plebes baptismi myste-  
 ‘ rium consequantur. Cum hoc sibi privilegium et  
 ‘ apud nos et apud omnes ecclesias dominicum spe-  
 ‘ cialiter cum Pentecoste sua pascha defendat: qui-  
 ‘ bus solis per annum diebus ad fidem confluentibus  
 ‘ generalia baptismatis tradi convenit sacramenta.  
 ‘ His duntaxat electis, qui ante quadraginta vel eo  
 ‘ amplius dies nomen dederint, et exorcismis quoti-  
 ‘ dianisque orationibus atque jejuniis fuerint expiati,  
 ‘ quatenus apostolica illa impleatur præceptio, *ut*  
 ‘ *expurgato fermento veteri nova incipiat esse con-*  
 ‘ *persio.*

‘ Sicut sacram ergo Paschalem reverentiam in  
 ‘ nullo dicimus esse minuendam, ita infantibus qui  
 ‘ necdum loqui poterunt per ætatem, vel his quibus  
 ‘ in qualibet necessitate opus fuerit sacri unda bap-  
 ‘ tismatis, omni volumus celeritate succurri: ne ad  
 ‘ nostrarum perniciem tendat animarum si negato  
 ‘ desiderantibus fonte salutari, exiens unusquisque  
 ‘ de seculo et regnum perdat et vitam.

‘ Quicumque etiam discrimen naufragii, hostilitatis  
 ‘ incursum, obsidionis ambiguum, vel cujuslibet cor-

<sup>z</sup> [Apud Labbei Concilia, tom. ii. p. 1017.—edit. Mansi, tom. iii. p. 656.]

‘poralis ægritudinis desperationem inciderint, et  
 ‘sibi unico credulitatis auxilio poposcerint subve-  
 ‘niri, eodem quo poscunt momento temporis expe-  
 ‘titæ regenerationis præmia consequantur.’

CHAP.  
XVII.

284.  
(A.D. 384.)

‘There is also a blameable disorder which ought  
 ‘to be amended, in baptizing at various times  
 ‘as every one fancies; which our fellow bishops  
 ‘among you do venture to practise, as I am some-  
 ‘what vexed to hear, not by the rule of any  
 ‘authority, but by mere rashness. So that great  
 ‘numbers of people do, as you say, receive their  
 ‘baptism, some at Christmas, some at the Epiphany,  
 ‘and some on the holy days of the apostles and  
 ‘martyrs. Whereas not only in our church, but in  
 ‘all churches, our Lord’s passover, [viz. Easter,]  
 ‘together with its Pentecost, does peculiarly chal-  
 ‘lenge this privilege to itself. On which days of  
 ‘the year alone, it is fitting that the common sacra-  
 ‘ments of baptism should be given to those that  
 ‘come to the faith. And that those only should be  
 ‘admitted who had given in their names forty days  
 ‘or more before, and have been cleansed by exor-  
 ‘cisms, [or renunciations of the devil and wicked-  
 ‘ness,] and daily prayers and fastings, to the end  
 ‘that that precept of the apostle may be fulfilled, of  
 ‘*purging out the old leaven, that there may be a*  
 ‘*new lump.*

‘As therefore I affirm that the respect due to the  
 ‘feast of Easter ought by no means to be dimin-  
 ‘ished; so my meaning is, that as for infants, who  
 ‘by reason of their age, are not yet able to speak,  
 ‘and others that are in any case of necessity, they  
 ‘ought to be relieved with all speed possible; lest  
 ‘it turn to the perdition of our own souls, if we

CHAP. XVII. ‘ deny the water of salvation to any one that stands  
 in need, and they departing this life, do lose their  
 kingdom and their life.

<sup>284.</sup>

(A.D. 384.)

‘ Whoever also shall be in danger of shipwreck,  
 ‘ or of the assaults of enemies, or of a siege, or shall  
 ‘ be likely to die of any bodily sickness, and shall  
 ‘ desire to be assisted with that which is the only  
 ‘ armour of our faith, [or religion,] that they have  
 ‘ the gift of regeneration which they desire, the same  
 ‘ moment that they desire it.’

I have set down this the more at large, because we see by it, that at the same time when they insist upon those preparations, and personal qualifications of the adult, they do except the case of infants. It is common for some antipædobaptist writers to quote such passages as the forepart of this, taken by itself, would be, as testimonies that such authors allowed no baptism of infants, because they require those preparatory exercises of all that are to be baptized. This I have seen done a hundred times, when the same author that is quoted does sometimes in the same treatise, (as here,) and sometimes in other parts of his works, shew that infants are to be baptized, as being in a case that is exempt from the general rule that requires faith, prayer, repentance, and other personal preparation. It is no wonder that they do thus with other books, when they can hardly forbear doing it with the Catechism of the church of England, which requires repentance and faith of persons to be baptized; but shews by the next words, that the case of infants is an exempt case. This practice though not always so palpable, yet is in effect always as unfair, as that with which Wills charges Danvers, viz. for quoting



the canon of a certain council, as enacting, that CHAP.  
‘none should receive baptism, without rehearsing XVII.  
‘the Creed, or Lord’s Prayer,’ and stopping there; <sup>284.</sup>  
when the next words are ‘Except those, who by (A.D.384.)  
‘reason of age, cannot yet speak<sup>a</sup>.’

That which Siricius here says, that it was the custom of the church of Rome, and of all other churches, to give baptism only at Easter and Whitsuntide, excepting infants, sick people, and other such extraordinary cases, may be proved from a great many other authors. I shall mention no more but Tertullian, for his antiquity. He says, ‘The most solemn time for baptism is Easter, at which time the passion of our Lord, into which we are baptized, was performed:—After that, the Pentecost affords a large time for ordering the lavers. —But yet every day is the Lord’s. Any hour, any time whatever is capable to be made use of for baptism. Though there be some difference as to the solemnity, there is none as to the grace given<sup>b</sup>.’

IV. I said that this epistle appears to be genuine, and not forged, among the others of the foregoing popes, by the mention that is made of it, by authors so ancient and so learned, as not to be imposed on by that forgery. This very passage of it is quoted by Hincmarus Rhemensis<sup>c</sup> anno 835, and by the

<sup>a</sup> Appeal to Baptists against H. D. ch. i. [at p. 161 of ‘Vindiciæ Vindiciarum, or a vindication of a late treatise entitled, “Infant Baptism asserted,” in answer to Mr. Danvers’ Reply: also an appeal to the Baptists (so called) against Mr. Danvers,’ &c. by Obed. Wills, M. A. 12mo. London, 1675.]

<sup>b</sup> De baptismo, cap. 19.

<sup>c</sup> Opusculo 55. Capitulorum, cap. 31. [Opuscula et Epistolæ

CHAP. council of Tribur<sup>d</sup>, anno 895. And, I suppose, other  
 XVII. parts of it may have been quoted by earlier writers,  
 —————  
 (A.D.<sup>284</sup>.384.) which I have not had occasion to observe. The pre-  
 735. tended Isidore, out of whose shop the forged collec-  
 tion of epistles is supposed first to have come, lived  
 about these times, and seems to have been contem-  
 porary with Hincmarus, but something the elder :  
 but as all forged works do require some time after  
 their first hatching, to be known, or at least to gain  
 any authority : there is no likelihood that so learned  
 men (as Hincmarus especially was) should quote  
 any thing upon a dependance on so fresh an impos-  
 ture. Especially when neither he nor the council  
 do quote it as from Isidore, but as an epistle gene-  
 rally known in the world. And besides, the learned  
 critics, Quesnellus, Du Pin, &c., that do question  
 one of Siricius' epistles, as being to be suspected of  
 forgery for reasons they give, do make no question  
 of this.

795. By the said quotations of Hincmarus and Con-  
 cilium Triburiense, it also appears, that the custom  
 of limiting the baptism of adult persons to Easter,  
 and the times aforesaid, continued in the church till  
 their time : and it did continue something longer.  
 But of later times we hear no more of it. I suppose  
 because the baptisms of adult persons grew to be  
 very few ; the heathen nations being now become  
 Christian ; and hardly any but infants being bap-  
 tized, which were not contained in that rule. For  
 it was but about 300 years after this time 890, that

Hincmari Remensis Archiepiscopi, 4<sup>o</sup>. Lutetiæ, 1615, reprinted  
 in the Bibliotheca Patrum, 1618. tom. ix. and in the Nova Bib-  
 liotheca, sive Supplementum, fol. 1639. tom. ii.]

<sup>d</sup> Can. 12.

Petrus Cluniacensis writing against some that at CHAP. XVII. that time, anno Dom. 1130, set up a doctrine that baptism given to an infant is no baptism, opposed 284. (A.D. 384.) to them this among other things; that ‘if it were  
‘so, then, whereas all Europe has had never a per-  
‘son now for 300, or hardly any for 500 years, 1030.  
‘baptized otherwise than in infancy, it has had  
‘never a Christian in it.’ The place I quote more largely hereafter<sup>e</sup>.

V. This order of the ancient church, that no adult person, except in case of necessity, should be baptized but at these set and appointed times, was made for a very good and weighty reason, viz. because there was not so much care likely to be taken of his instruction and examination if he were baptized at some other time of the year alone by himself, as there was if he were baptized at Easter, when the other catechumeni were baptized. Because for some weeks before Easter, the ministers of the church made it their business to catechise, examine, and prepare the candidates for baptism. They were to give in their names forty days before; and they were to be able to repeat the Creed, &c., and to give account of their faith twenty days before, (something more or less, according to the canons of the several churches,) and the people came together to hear these examinations and professions; and care was taken that they did spend the time in prayers, fastings, and such other holy exercises as would fit them for so great a change of their state. And, because there were at Easter a great number of them, and the spiritual good of the church did in

<sup>e</sup> Part ii. ch. vii. §. 5.



CHAP. great measure depend upon their doing well ; it was  
 XVII. counted an occasion weighty enough to require that  
 284.  
 (A.D. 384.) the whole church should at that time pray and fast  
 with them and for them, as I quoted out of Justin  
 Martyr. ‘They are directed to pray, and ask of God  
 ‘ with fasting, the forgiveness of their former sins,  
 ‘ and we also pray and fast together with them<sup>f</sup>.’

And this, I believe, was none of the least occasions  
 of keeping the fast of Lent before Easter.

And we see also to this day some remains of the  
 catechising used then ; for though the church of  
 England do now appoint catechising all the year  
 long, yet most of the curates therein omit it all the  
 year, except the time of Lent ; but at that time  
 that office is by old custom kept on foot. It was to  
 prepare the candidates for baptism at Easter, that  
 the Lent catechising was used.

Also in the Liturgy of the same church, and in  
 that of the church of Rome, the collect for the third  
 Sunday after Easter remains in that form which  
 seems to have been composed at first with a parti-  
 cular respect to the new baptized persons. ‘Al-  
 ‘ mighty God, who shewest to them that be in error  
 ‘ the light of thy truth, to the intent that they may  
 ‘ return into the way of righteousness ; grant unto  
 ‘ all them that are admitted into the fellowship of  
 ‘ Christ’s religion, that they may eschew those  
 ‘ things that are contrary to their profession, and  
 ‘ follow all such things as are agreeable to the same,  
 ‘ through our Lord Jesus Christ.’ This is a good  
 prayer at all times, and for all persons ; but I be-  
 lieve the first composing it for that Sunday was in

<sup>f</sup> Chap. ii. §. 2.

regard to the neophytes. The collects for Easter, and the two Sundays following, referring to the resurrection, the next was for them.

CHAP.  
XVII.  

---

284.  
(A.D. 384.)

VI. The ninth chapter or canon of the same epistle of Siricius, is, to blame the people of Spain for choosing into the ministry some such as had been but lately converted to the Christian religion; and he gives them this direction :

‘Quicumque igitur se ecclesiæ vovit [i. vovet] obsequiis, a sua infantia ante pubertatis annos baptizari et lectorum debet ministerio sociari.’

‘He that devotes himself to the service of the church, ought to be baptized [i. e. ought to be one that was baptized] in his infancy, before ripeness of age, and employed in the office of the readers.’

This rule was a little after repeated to the people of Spain, by Innocentius, in words just to the same purpose, only a little plainer, which I shall recite presently.

VII. After Siricius, Anastasius sat but about three or four years, and was succeeded by Innocentius the first. He must have been a man of note in the church before the year 400, for it was in the year 402 that he was made bishop of Rome. He also has some decretal epistles (besides those to the council of Carthage, which I shall cite hereafter) that mention infant-baptism, and are by all acknowledged to be genuine.

His first is written to Decentius, bishop of Eugubium, giving him his resolution in several things, wherein he had demanded it; whereof the third is, that though the presbyters might baptize infants, yet only bishops might give them the chrism, or

CHAP. anointing on the forehead, which was in those times  
XVII. given after baptism: it is as follows:

<sup>300.</sup>  
(A.D.400.)

*Epistolæ Decretalis Innocentii ad Decentium,*

Canon 3.<sup>g</sup>

‘ De consignandis vero infantibus, manifestum est  
‘ non ab alio quam ab episcopo fieri licere. Nam  
‘ presbyteri, licet sint sacerdotes, pontificatus tamen  
‘ apicem non habent. Hæc autem pontificibus solis  
‘ deberi, ut vel consignent, vel Paracletum Spiritum  
‘ tradant, non solum consuetudo ecclesiastica de-  
‘ monstrat, verum et illa lectio Actuum Apostolorum  
‘ quæ asserit Petrum et Joannem esse directos, qui  
‘ jam baptizatis traderent Spiritum Sanctum. Nam  
‘ presbyteris, seu extra episcopum, seu præsentem  
‘ episcopum cum baptizant, chrismate baptizatos un-  
‘ gere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum;  
‘ non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod  
‘ solis debetur episcopis,’ &c.

‘ As for the anointing of infants on the forehead  
‘ with the chrism, it is plain that that ought to be  
‘ done by none but the bishop. For presbyters,  
‘ though they be as priests, yet they have not the  
‘ preeminence of the chief priests. And that it is  
‘ lawful for the chief priests only, either to anoint  
‘ on the forehead, or give the Holy Spirit, appears  
‘ not only by the custom of the church, but also  
‘ by that place in the Acts of the Apostles, which  
‘ tells us<sup>h</sup>, that Peter and John were sent to give  
‘ the Holy Spirit to such as were already baptized.  
‘ For when presbyters do give baptism, either in the  
‘ presence of the bishop, or out of his presence, they

<sup>g</sup> [Apud Concilia, edit. Labb. tom. ii. p. 1246.—edit. Mansi, tom. iii. p. 1029.]

<sup>h</sup> Acts viii. 14.



‘ may anoint the baptized person with chrism, provided it be such as has been consecrated by the bishop; but they must not anoint the forehead with the same; for that is peculiar to the bishops,’ &c.

CHAP.  
XVII.

<sup>300.</sup>  
(A.D. 400.)

Though this place do not mention the baptism of these infants, yet it plainly supposes it. The chrism was never given to any till they were baptized.

The rule that he sets here, that none but the bishop must give the chrism on the forehead, was the ordinary and general rule of that church; but yet dispensed with in the case of want of bishops, or their default of doing their office, as I shew hereafter<sup>i</sup>.

VIII. The other passage of Innocentius, which is to the same effect with that which I recited from Siricius, is in his twenty-fourth epistle, which was written to a synod then met at Toledo; whereof the fifth chapter is a rule given for the qualifications of such as were to be admitted to the ministry. He had determined in the foregoing canons, that no lawyer, soldier, or officer of the temporal court, should be received to holy orders; and then gives the qualifications following.

*Epistolæ Innocentii primi ad Synodum Toletanam,*  
*Can. quintus<sup>k</sup>.*

‘ Quales vero eligendi sunt in ordine clericorum, evidens forma declarat, i. e. qui ab ineunte ætate baptizati fuerint, et lectorum officio sociati, vel si majores sunt, cum fuerint Dei gratiam consecuti, statim se ecclesiasticis ordinibus mancipaverint.’

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. ch. ix. §. 8.

<sup>k</sup> [Apud Concilia, edit. Labb. tom. ii. p. 1278.—edit. Mansi, iii. p. 1065.]

CHAP.  
XVII.(A.D.<sup>300.</sup>  
400.)

‘And as to the qualifications of such as are to be chosen into the ministry, there is a certain rule, viz. that they be such as have been baptized from their infancy, and have been educated in the office of readers: or, if they were older before they obtained the grace of God, then that they be such as did presently upon it addict themselves to offices of the church.’

It has been often enough said already, that there were in those times, besides those that were baptized in infancy, several that turned from heathenism to Christianity at their ripe age. Such the canon would not have to be put into holy orders; but only such as were baptized in infancy: unless those so converted have, from their first coming to the faith, addicted themselves to the service of the church, in the lower offices: to prevent the inconvenience mentioned by St. Paul, in preferring novices<sup>1</sup>, or neophytes, i. e. persons but lately baptized or made Christians.

## CHAP. XVIII.

*Out of Paulinus bishop of Nola, and another Paulinus, deacon of the church of Milan.*

(A.D.<sup>293.</sup>  
393.)

§. I. PAULINUS, bishop of Nola, had been a heathen man: during which time he had addicted his mind to poetry and oratory. After he became a Christian, he made use of those faculties on religious subjects<sup>m</sup>. And Sulpitius Severus, who

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. iii. 6.

<sup>m</sup> [The works of Paulinus were published separately, in 1622, 1662, and 1688, &c. and are reprinted in the ‘Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima,’ edit. Lugdun. 1677. tom. vi.]

had built a church, desired him to compose some proper godly sentences to be written in several places of the church, and particularly at the font, or place of baptizing. Paulinus sends him a letter in answer, containing several such sentences: it is, Epist. 32. *Quæ est duodecima ex iis quæ sunt ad Severum.*

CHAP.  
XVIII.

<sup>293.</sup>  
(A.D. 393.)

And in one of them, composed in verse for the font, there is this distich,

‘ Inde parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos

‘ Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu <sup>n</sup>.

‘ The priest from the holy font does infants bring,

‘ In body, in soul, in garments white and clean.’

As he refers to the cleanness of the body, by washing in the font, and of the soul, on account of the forgiveness of sins granted in that holy sacrament; so what he speaks of the whiteness of their garments, is according to the custom then used all over the church, of clothing the new baptized persons, whether infants or grown people, in albes, or white garments.

II. If there were not testimonies enough of the custom of baptizing infants in this age, this alone would not be sufficient to prove it. For there being nothing but the word *infants* singly mentioned, without any other circumstances setting forth their age; and there being a custom about these times of calling, by a metaphorical speech, all the new baptized persons, infants, whether they were young or old; it is a question whether Paulinus did by that word intend to restrain the sense to infants

<sup>n</sup> [Bibl. Patr. tom. vi. p. 192.]



CHAP. XVIII. in age, or whether he meant only to describe the procession of the priest leading from the font a number of new baptized persons in general, in their albes.

<sup>293.</sup>  
(A.D.393.)

That there was such a custom of calling new baptized persons by the name of *infants*, about this time, appears by several instances. Gaudentius, who was bishop of Brescia about this time, has an oration, or sermon, in which he thus bespeaks the novices, or new baptized persons: ‘You are put in mind by the ‘name of infants, by which you are called, that you ‘are by your baptism regenerated and born anew; ‘and therefore if any of you that are married,’ &c. Also St. Austin<sup>p</sup> has a sermon or discourse entitled, *Ad infantes*, ‘to the infants,’ i. e. to a congregation of persons then newly baptized. And I confess it seems to me that that passage of St. Ambrose<sup>q</sup>, *De mysterio Paschæ*, c. 5. which Mr. Bingham, vol. iv. p. 24<sup>r</sup>, takes to be spoken of proper infants, is rather to be referred hither. He is there speaking of the holy Christian rites used at the feast of Easter, particularly the baptismal solemnity.

<sup>o</sup> Orat. 8. ad Neophytos, [de Lectione Evangelii; apud Bibl. Patr. tom. v. p. 954. edit. Lugd.]

<sup>p</sup> [Not only one, but five sermons of this father, preached on Easter-day, occur in his works, addressed either ‘ad infantes,’ or ‘ad populum et ad infantes, seu eo die baptizatos:’ viz. sermons 124 to 128; vol. v. p. 968, &c. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>q</sup> [This treatise, under the title of ‘Sermo xxxv. de Mysterio ‘Paschæ II.’ is placed among the pieces falsely attributed to St. Ambrose, in the Appendix to the Benedictine edition of his works, p. 438.]

<sup>r</sup> [Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, or *Antiquities of the Christian Church*: 8vo. 1708. &c. fol. 1726. 8vo. 1821–7. The passage referred to occurs in book xi. ch. 4. sect. 14.]

ties; and says, ‘Hinc vitalis lavacri sacræ ecclesiæ  
 ‘editi puerperio infantes, parvulorum simplicitate  
 ‘renati, balatu innocentis perstrepunt conscientiæ.  
 ‘Hinc casti patres, pudicæ etiam matres, novellam  
 ‘per fidem stirpem prosequantur innumeram.’ ‘Here  
 ‘the infants brought forth of the womb of the vital  
 ‘laver of the holy church, being regenerated in the  
 ‘simplicity of babes, do sing from the bottom of a  
 ‘sinless conscience. Here chaste fathers and mo-  
 ‘thers do follow great numbers of their children  
 ‘new born by faith.’ He means, I think, the god-  
 fathers following the new baptized persons, whom  
 they had brought to baptism; and who walked  
 from the font in procession in their albes.

This does not at all invalidate the testimonies  
 which have been given for infant-baptism. For in  
 all that I have quoted, except this and one or two  
 more, there is, beside the word *infant*, some cir-  
 cumstance that does shew the speech to be about  
 infants in age. It rather confirms the thing, and  
 is itself a testimony: for one reason of the name  
 was, that the number of Christians being now much  
 increased, and the baptism of Christian infants being  
 more frequent than of elder persons new converted,  
 these latter had the name of infants in allusion to  
 the former.

III. *Paulinus de obitu Celsi pueri.* On the  
 death of Celsus a child.

This Celsus was a child very dear to his parents,  
 that died at seven years old, or when he was newly  
 entered into his eighth, as appears by some passages  
 of the discourse.

His parents were so overmuch concerned at his  
 death, that Paulinus found it necessary to write to

CHAP. them a consolatory advice. It is written in verse,  
XVIII. and after the first distich follow these two:

- <sup>293.</sup>  
(A.D. 393.) ‘ Quem Dominus tanto cumulavit munere Christus,  
‘ Ut rudis ille annis, et novus iret aquis :  
‘ Atque bis infantem, spatio ævi, et fonte lavacri,  
‘ Congeminata Deo gratia perveheret <sup>s</sup>.’
- ‘ So great a favour Christ did to him show,  
‘ That he escaping all the snares below,  
‘ Should hence so young, and fresh from baptism go :  
‘ Two graces do his infant soul commend,  
‘ So little sullied, and so lately clean’d.’

This quotation is not fully to the purpose either of the pædobaptists or antipædobaptists: for the one will inquire why this child’s baptism was delayed so long as till he was almost seven years old; and the other, why he was baptized so soon. And there is not any such account of the condition of his parents, as to satisfy either of them. They might perhaps be, as Paulinus himself was, lately converted; or it might be deferred by negligence and procrastination. St. Austin somewhere, but I have forgot where, speaks of fourteen years as the soonest that people were ordinarily baptized on their own profession: yet at another place, where his adversary would prove that unbaptized children might go to heaven, by the instance of Dinocrates, a boy born of heathen parents, and dying at seven years old, whose soul was said in a certain story-book, to have been seen in heaven in a vision, by his sister in her prayers; he says, ‘ It is not impossible but ‘ that at that age he might have been baptized at ‘ his own choice,’ which place I have occasion to recite hereafter <sup>t</sup>.

<sup>s</sup> [Apud Bibl. Patr. vi. p. 267.]

<sup>t</sup> Ch. xx. §. 3.



It is plain enough by what has been said, that the ordinary time of baptizing infants was within a little time after their birth. And the antipædobaptists, I suppose, do not think a child of seven years old, any fitter than a mere infant.

CHAP.  
XVIII.  
<sup>293.</sup>  
(A.D. 393.)

The custom that I mentioned, of calling new baptized persons by the name of infants, is alluded to here: for Paulinus calls this child, *bis infantem*, in two respects an infant, viz. *spatio ævi et fonte lavacri*, an infant in age, and an infant, as newly baptized.

Paulinus has some letters and tracts attributed to<sup>395</sup> him, that are spurious: but this is recited among his works, by Gennadius, in these words: ‘ Paulinus ‘ bishop of Nola in Campania wrote many things ‘ in way of short poems; and a consolatory tract to ‘ Celsus, in form of an epitaph, on the death of his ‘ Christian and baptized infant, full of Christian ‘ hope<sup>u</sup>,’ &c.

*Paulini Epistola ad Hieronymum de duabus  
Quæstionibus, apud Hieronym. Ep. 153<sup>x</sup>.*

IV. Paulinus in this letter desired St. Hierome’s opinion of the meaning of two sayings which the Scripture uses.

One was, what is said, Exod. ix. 12. He asks ‘ Why [or in what sense] Pharaoh’s heart was ‘ hardened by God?’ And also, how that which the apostle says, is to be understood, *It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy<sup>y</sup>*; which seems to take away freewill.

<sup>u</sup> Catalog. Virorum illustrium. [cap. 48. p. 165, edit. Colôn. 1580.]

<sup>x</sup> [In edit. Vallarsii, ep. 85. Op. tom. i. p. 529.]

<sup>y</sup> Rom. ix. 16.

CHAP. The other was concerning that text, 1 Cor. vii.  
 XVIII. 14. *Else were your children unclean, but now are*  
 293. *they holy.* On which Paulinus asks this question,  
 (A.D. 393.)

‘ Quomodo sancti sint qui de fidelibus, id est, de  
 ‘ baptizatis nascuntur; cum sine dono gratiæ postea  
 ‘ acceptæ et custoditæ salvi esse non possint?’

‘ How those children that are born of *fidel*, that  
 ‘ is, of baptized parents, are holy; whereas, without  
 ‘ the gift of the grace [of baptism], afterward [viz.  
 ‘ after their birth] received and preserved, they can-  
 ‘ not be saved?’

He seems at this place to have taken the obvious sense of St. Paul’s words to be, that the infants of Christian parents are holy from their birth; and desires to know what holiness this is that St. Paul ascribes to them from their birth; since though the parents be baptized Christians, yet unless the children also be themselves baptized, they cannot be saved.

This is the most material of the evidences we have from him on this subject: for if it be concluded, as he does here conclude, that infants cannot be saved without baptism; it will undoubtedly follow in any one’s sense, that they ought to be baptized without delay.

V. This letter of Paulinus is not extant, that I know of, and perhaps was never published. But St. Hierome, in his answer to it, which is his Epist. 153. [85.] *ad Paulinum*, recites out of it what I have here set down.

He makes his answer very short, and that for two reasons which he gives: One was, that by every ship that sailed for the west, he had so many letters of this nature to send, that he could not bestow pains

on any one, but was forced to write whatever came extempore into his mind. The other was, that to so great a critic as Paulinus, he did not dare write a long letter, in which the more faults would be found.

CHAP.  
XVIII.

<sup>293.</sup>  
(A.D. 393.)

It shews us by the way, how diligent people were at that time in seeking to have the true sense of scripture; and of how great repute St. Hierome's learning was; when Paulinus, and so many others, sent letters a thousand miles to him to desire his opinion.

St. Hierome refers him, for an answer to his first question, to Origen's book *περὶ ἀρχῶν*, which he had then newly translated into Latin, and whereof he might have a copy in Pammachius' hands, to whom he had dedicated and sent it. And for the second, his answer is this :

‘ Of your second question Tertullian has discoursed in his books *de Monogamia*, [leg. *de Anima*,] holding that the children of Christians are styled holy, as being candidates [or, expectants] of the faith, and not polluted with any idolatrous filth or trumpery.

‘ Also you may mind that we read of the vessels of the tabernacle being called holy, and many other utensils of the ceremonies; whereas nothing can be properly holy, but what has sense, and fears God. It is therefore a phrase of scripture sometimes to call those holy that are clean and purified, or expiated from uncleanness, as Bathsheba is said to be sanctified [or, made holy] from her uncleanness.

‘ I entreat you not to impute to me either trifling,



CHAP. XVIII. ' or wrong interpretation : for God is witness to my  
 (A.D. 393.)<sup>293.</sup> ' conscience, that the hurry I have mentioned to  
 ' you, has hindered me from so much as setting  
 ' on, or attempting the interpretation of the place.  
 ' And you know nothing is done to any purpose in  
 ' a hurry.'

St. Hierome had some reason to make an apology for so slight and perfunctory an explication. Yet as it is, it shews that he, as well as Paulinus, thought that such children could not be called holy in any such sense as should entitle them to salvation, unless they were baptized. If he had thought they could, the ready way to take off Paulinus' doubt, had been to answer so: the doubt being this; how they are holy from their birth, since without baptism they cannot be saved? But he answers,

1. By referring him to Tertullian's account of this place in his book *de Anima*, which I recited before<sup>z</sup>, where he paraphrases the text in this sense, ' They are holy, that is, they are designed for holiness; for as for any other meaning, our Lord has determined, that without baptism none shall enter into the kingdom of God<sup>a</sup>, which is as much as to say, none shall be holy.'

2. By giving some instances where the word *holy* is applied to some things that are not capable of salvation, or of moral good or evil.

Calvin, and many that have followed him, have boldly ventured on that explication which Paulinus durst not embrace, nor St. Hierome advise, and which Tertullian disapproves. They have determined, that a believer's child is holy, i. e. is born to

<sup>z</sup> Ch. iv. §. 6.

<sup>a</sup> John iii. 5.

salvation, (or as a certain late commentator<sup>b</sup>, supposed to be Mr. Locke, has absurdly paraphrased that place, ‘born a member of the Christian church,’) CHAP.  
XVIII.  

---

 whether it be baptized or not: that baptism is to be given it indeed, but only as a seal of that holiness, which it has by covenant before it be baptized. And to this purpose they expound that text, John iii. 5, of any thing rather than of baptism. And many of them have determined that the authority of baptizing infants is grounded only on that birth-privilege which they have before; and that no other infants than such as are so holy by their birth, may, or ought to be baptized. Which doctrine involves the baptizer in endless scruples, which infants he may baptize, and which not: as bishop Stillingfleet has largely shewn in the book to which I referred before<sup>c</sup>. 293.  
(A.D. 393.)

He that has read the foregoing chapters, is by this time satisfied, that all the ancients understood our Saviour’s words, John iii. 5, of baptism: or will be, by what I shall produce<sup>d</sup>. And that they never refused to baptize a child on account of the parents’ wickedness, or even heathenism or infidelity, if the child were offered to baptism by such as were the then owners of the child<sup>e</sup>.

Much less do the explications given by the ancients, of the holiness here spoken of, fit or square to that jejune one given by some antipædobaptists,

<sup>b</sup> [In ‘A paraphrase and notes on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians, with an essay for the understanding of St. Paul’s Epistles,’ &c.—London, 1705, 1707, 1709, 1742, &c.]

<sup>c</sup> Ch. xi. §. 11.

<sup>d</sup> See part ii. ch. vi. §. 1.

<sup>e</sup> See part ii. ch. vi. §. 10.

CHAP. XVIII. that St. Paul should mean no more but that the children of believers, though one of the parents do  
 293.  
 (A.D. 393.) continue in unbelief, are legitimate, and not bastards; which looks as made merely to serve a turn.

On the contrary, the general vein of ancient interpretation is, to understand by this holiness, baptismal holiness, either as given, or designed to be given: as has appeared partly by this quotation, and by some others given before<sup>f</sup>, and will more fully hereafter, where I mean to confer together all the ancient expositions of this text that I know of<sup>g</sup>.

*Paulinus in vita Ambrosii.* [§. 48. edit. Benedict.

Append. tom. ii. p. xiii.]

297.  
 (A.D. 397.) VI. The other Paulinus was a deacon of the church of Milan, that ministered to St. Ambrose in his lifetime<sup>h</sup>, and after he was dead, wrote the history of his life, which is commonly printed with his works. Erasmus takes this piece for a forgery<sup>i</sup> of later years, because many of the passages he relates, look so like the fabulous stories of the monks: and I am almost of his opinion, partly for his reason, and partly for another which I mention hereafter<sup>k</sup>. It must either be so, or else this Paulinus must have been a very vain and credulous man. Neither would I set down the passage here following, which seems as fabulous and idle as any of them, were it not that most of the critics and learned

<sup>f</sup> Ch. iv. §. 12. Ch. xi. §. 11. Ch. xii. §. 2.

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xix. §. 19.

<sup>h</sup> [The Benedictine editors observe, that in many manuscripts he is styled St<sup>i</sup>. Ambrosii *notarius*.]

<sup>i</sup> *Censura operibus Ambrosii præfixa.*

<sup>k</sup> Part ii. ch. iii. §. 9.



men have an opinion of the authenticity of the tract, and do commonly quote it. CHAP.  
XVIII.

He relates a great many different occasions, on which St. Ambrose's ghost or shape appeared to several persons, after he was dead: and, among the rest, how he having departed this life on Easter eve, his body was carried and laid in the great church. 297.  
(A.D.397.)

‘Ibique eadem fuit nocte qua vigilavimus in pascha. Quem plurimi infantes baptizati, quum a fonte venirent, viderunt: ita ut aliqui sedentem in cathedra tribunali dicerent; alii vero ambulantem suis parentibus digito ostenderent. Sed illi videntes videre non poterant, quia mundatos oculos non habebant.’

‘And there it was that night which we spend in watching at Easter [this was the night before Easter-day, on which in the primitive times the whole body of the people did always sit up all night in the church at their prayers]. And a great many of the infants that were then baptized saw him as they came back from the font: some of them saying, there he sits in the bishop's chair: others of them shewed him to their parents, pointing with their hands, that he was going there up the steps [walking]: but the parents looking could not see him, because they had not their eyes cleansed [or enlightened].’

There you have the story, such as it is; grounded probably on the superstitious conceits of women and boys: but yet it shews that there were children among those that were baptized on that day. He calls them infants, but some of them could not be absolute infants, for he mentions their speaking:

CHAP. XVIII. they seem to have been little boys carried in their parents' arms, or led in their hands.

<sup>297.</sup>  
(A.D. 397.) These infants, according to this story, being by their baptism just then received, clear from all sin, had their eyes enlightened to see this miracle: but their parents, having been since their baptism stained with many sins, were not capable of it. They called baptism, both in the scripture-times, as appears from Heb. vi. 4, and also in these times, φωτισμὸς, the illumination, or enlightening of a person.

---

## CHAP. XIX.

*Out of St. Hierome and St. Austin, after the rise of the Pelagian Controversy; as also out of Pelagius, Cælestius, Innocent the First, Zosimus, Julianus, Theodorus Mopsuestensis, &c. And out of the Councils of Carthage, Diospolis, Milevis, &c.*

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.) §. 1. A NEW heresy, happening in the church at this time, gave more occasion to speak of infant-baptism than ever had been before. Not that any of the parties disapproved it; but one of them held that there is no original sin in infants, and that brought in much discourse about their baptism.

Pelagius, a monk, living at Rome, was the author of this heresy; at least, the first promoter of it in the west. And one Cælestius another monk, was his chief abetter; and afterward, Julianus a bishop, and Anianus a deacon. It was not started till the year of Christ 410. But most of the managers on each side were men of note before the year 400.

The men that I named were the only writers of

the Pelagian side : but a considerable number of the people was brought over to incline to their opinions. They argued, that the doctrine of original sin and natural corruption, by which persons are supposed to be born under a necessity of sinning, did cast a reflection on the honour and justice of God, who gives us our being : and this argument was plausible among the vulgar.

CHAP.  
XIX.  

---

310.  
(A.D. 410.)

Consequently to this, they said that baptism of infants was not for any sin they had, but to gain them admittance into the kingdom of heaven. For they said that children, though they were not baptized, should have an eternal and happy life ; not in the kingdom of heaven indeed, because our Saviour, John iii. 5, had determined the contrary : but somewhere, they knew not where.

This, with the rest of their opinions, is briefly set forth by St. Austin, lib. *de Hæresibus*, cap. 88, [Op. tom. viii. p. 25.]

II. For better apprehending the sense of the quotations which we shall produce, a short history of the steps and progress of this sect would be useful : which is also the more necessary, because a late author has wrote the history of it very partially for those heretics. Pretending to give<sup>1</sup> an abstract of what bishop Ussher<sup>m</sup> had collected of this history, he has picked out of it for the most part only such circumstances and such sayings of Pelagius, as taken

<sup>1</sup> M. Le Clerc, in *Bibliothèque Universelle*, tom. viii. p. 174-237. 120. Amst. 1688.

<sup>m</sup> *Britannic. Ecclesiarum Antiquitates; quibus inserta est pestiferæ adversus Dei gratiam a Pelagio Britanno inductæ hæreseos Historia.* [First printed at Dublin, 4º. 1639; and, enlarged and corrected by the author, fol. London, 1687.]



CHAP. by themselves, sound most favourably for him; and  
 XIX. such of St. Austin and St. Hierome as are most  
 (A.D.<sup>310.</sup> 410.) liable to exception.

It is great pity that among all the learned and true histories of Pelagianism, only that should have the luck to be translated into English. But the world knows now by whose means that, and the Lives of some Fathers<sup>n</sup>, written by the same author, and in the same vein, have been tacked together, and put into the hands of our vulgar readers.

It seems that, though it be a great fault to write the lives of the catholic Fathers encomiastically, yet it is none to write the lives of the old heretics so. And one that in reading the books of the ancient Christians, passes by the best, and picks out for a specimen of their works, what may be censured in them, is a good author; though he that passes by

<sup>n</sup> [The work alluded to in the text is, 'The lives of Clemens ' Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Prudentius ; ' containing an impartial account of their lives and writings, together with several curious observations upon both. Also, a short ' history of Pelagianism. Written originally in French by M. Le ' Clerc, and now translated into English.' London, 1696. 8°.—In the advertisement the translator repeats Le Clerc's complaint, that hitherto *panegyrics* alone had been written on the Fathers, and that *impartial accounts* of them and their doctrines were still wanting and very necessary : he adds, 'it was also thought fit to ' print the *history of Pelagianism*, though very short, together ' with these lives: because several gentlemen may be desirous ' to have in their own tongue an impartial account of that controversy which formerly made so great a noise in the Christian ' world.'

The originals, from which this version is made, occur in Le Clerc's 'Bibliothèque Universelle,' tom. x. &c. in the shape of dissertations and reviews of editions of the works of those Fathers.]

their *nævi*, and takes most notice of what is most material, does so great a mischief°. Or else it is, that the booksellers of Amsterdam will give more money for the copy of a book of the first than of the latter sort, not regarding which does most good or hurt to the cause of Christianity; but which men will have the most curiosity to see and to buy. As it is said of Bleau, that he procured a Socinian book which he had printed, to be burnt by the hangman, that the edition might sell the better<sup>p</sup>.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.)

This author notes<sup>q</sup>, that we have no account of Cælestius' doctrine but from his adversaries: though St. Austin quotes largely the acts of the council where he spoke, and his own books. And, that possibly the sayings objected to him in the council were but consequences drawn from what he had said: though his book and the chapters of it be quoted in the council. And concludes that St. Austin and Pelagius did not understand one another's terms and meaning: and that in many parts of this dispute, they were like two men of different languages, that should scold as loud as they could, without understanding what each other said: and reciting the emperor's edict against the Pelagians, says, 'suspicious persons will think this edict, expressed in so pathetic terms, comes from the pen of some eccle-

° [These observations are levelled against M. Le Clerc's assertions, in the preface to his life of Clemens Alexandrinus.]

<sup>p</sup> See 'La Religion des Hollandois, [représentée en plusieurs lettres écrites par un Officier de l'armée du Roy, à un pasteur et professeur de théologie de Berne.] 16°. A Cologne, 1673, p. 83.

William Bleau was a celebrated and excellent printer, established at Amsterdam.]

<sup>q</sup> P. 182. ed. 1688.

CHAP. 'sistical zealot.' One may know whom he means.  
XIX.

And endeavouring to shew that St. Austin and St. Hierome, the chief opposers of the Pelagian doctrine, do contradict one another about a main point of it, viz. the possibility of keeping the commandments; he, by a gross mistake, quotes<sup>r</sup> Pelagius' words against Hierome, as if they were St. Austin's, (as I shall by and by shew, having occasion to recite<sup>s</sup> those words,) at which rate he may well prove that St. Austin contradicts St. Hierome.

I call this mistake gross, because bishop Ussher, in the treatise which the man is here epitomizing, shews that the 191st Sermon *de Tempore*, among the works of St. Austin<sup>t</sup>, (from whence these words are taken,) is not his, but is long ago known to be Pelagius' confession of faith to pope Innocent. And, which makes it the more unpardonable, he himself had a little before<sup>u</sup> followed Ussher in observing that that piece, which among the works of St. Hierome<sup>x</sup>, is called *Symboli Explanatio ad Damasum*, is really Pelagius' said confession: and if he had looked into this 191st Sermon *de Tempore*, which he here quotes, he would have seen that and the said *Symboli Explanatio* to be both one. And bishop Ussher, where he observes the one, observes the other. The man that is capable of such palpable mistakes in the main matters which he is arguing, ought, for shame, give over criticising with so cen-

<sup>r</sup> Page 219.

<sup>s</sup> §. 29. Notes on Pelagius' Creed, note o.

<sup>t</sup> [In the Benedictine edition it is transferred, among other spurious pieces, to the Appendix of tom. v. p. 388. Sermon. 236.]

<sup>u</sup> Page 180.

<sup>x</sup> [It is printed in tom. xi. p. 146. of the edition published by Vallarsius.]



serious a contempt as he does, on the works of men of known and solid learning; where the matter that he remarks is for the most part only some trifling nicety.

CHAP.  
XIX.

310.  
(A.D. 410.)

III. Pelagius was a Briton born: the only man of that ancient church that ever made a figure in the Roman world. He is supposed to have been called here in his own country, Morgan: because that name in the British language signifies the same that Pelagius does in Latin and Greek, viz. *belonging to the sea*. He lived a good while at Rome, in great credit and esteem for piety, parts, and learning; respected and loved by the most accomplished men of that time, such as St. Austin, Paulinus, Rufinus, &c. Even they that condemned his opinion owned his ingenuity. Most nations that have had any very learned or ingenious man in the most ancient times, keep his works as a monument of remembrance. Pelagius' works were most of them, not all, tinctured with his heresy; and the chief of them are lost. Those that remain, though they are by nigh two hundred years the ancientest of any extant written by a native of this land, yet have not had the favour to be done into English. I have occasion to give by and by his confession of faith at large, which is so handsomely drawn up, that it has passed, as was observed before, sometimes for St. Austin's, sometimes for St. Hierome's.

Some late writers do think he was a Scotsman. And Garnier the Jesuit has lately set up that opinion, by running into a mistake<sup>y</sup> of the sense of a

<sup>y</sup> [In a tract subjoined to his edition of the theological works of Marius Mercator, fol. Paris, 1673, reprinted in vol. xii. or the

CHAP. place in St Hierome<sup>z</sup>, which mistake bishop Ussher  
XIX. had rectified long before<sup>a</sup>. All that is in it is this.  
(A.D.<sup>310.</sup><sub>410.</sub>) Cælestius was an Irishman: and they at that time  
were called *Scoti*, and their country *Scotia*. And  
therefore of him indeed St. Hierome says<sup>b</sup>, ‘ he is by  
‘ origin of the Scotch nation:’ and again, ‘ *Scotorum*  
‘ *pultibus prægravatus,*’ ‘ having his belly filled, and  
‘ his head bedulled, with Scotch porridge.’ And  
Dempster<sup>c</sup> the Scot took on him to maintain, that not  
only he, but a great many others that in old writings  
are called *Scoti*, were of that Scotland which now  
goes by that name: whom bishop Ussher does  
handsomely expose for that mistake. And yet it is  
followed by Mr. Le Clerc, as to Cælestius. But if  
that were true, it would not concern Pelagius, whom  
St. Hierome does at that place distinguish from  
Cælestius, as Pluto from Cerberus.

All ancient writers style him a Briton: and  
Dempster himself (using the word improperly) calls  
him English. And we understand by St. Austin

Appendix to the Benedictine edition of St. Austin, Dissert. I. cap.  
iv. p. 66.]

<sup>z</sup> [Epist. ad Ctesiphontem, 133.—Op. tom. i. p. 1032.]

<sup>a</sup> Brit. Eccles. Antiq. cap. 8. p. 209, ed. 1639. [p. 113, ed.  
1687.]

<sup>b</sup> Procem. in lib. i. et procem. in lib. iii. Comment. in Jere-  
miam. [Op. tom. iv. p. 835, 923.]

<sup>c</sup> [Thomæ Demsteri Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Scotorum,  
4<sup>o</sup>. Bononiæ 1627. vid. lib. xv.—In the preface to the valuable  
reprint of this work by the Bannatyne Club, 2 vols. 4<sup>o</sup>. Edinburgh  
1829, Dr. Irving the editor pleasantly but truly remarks, ‘ *Sco-*  
‘ *torum complures, si fides Demstero habenda, multa literis man-*  
‘ *darunt sexcentis ferme annis ante literas in Scotiam invectas.*’  
—And again, ‘ *Tam portentosam sibi bibliothecam adornaverat*  
‘ *Thomas ille noster:—quocunque ferunt pedes, scriptores invenit*  
‘ *ille Scotos.*’]

[Ep. 106. *ad Paulinum*], that he was commonly called Pelagius Brito, to distinguish him from another Pelagius of Tarentum. As for the present Scotland, Garnier, and they that take this from him, ought, if they compare the time in which Pelagius lived, to remember that at that time that country was as fruitful of authors, as Lapland or Greenland is now.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.)

IV. Pelagius had written some learned works, as Three Books of the Trinity, &c., before <sup>d</sup> he fell into those new opinions against original sin, and against the necessity of God's grace for our doing good works; which were the two chief of the heterodox tenets held by him. And when he had in his own breast entertained them, he at first expressed them sily in discourse among the people, or wrote them as the objections of other men <sup>e</sup>, (much after the rate as bishop Taylor of late days wrote his Arguments for Antipædobaptism,) as if it were only for disputation sake. These his discourses were remembered and more minded afterwards.

So for example, before he declared himself, he wrote a short exposition on St. Paul's Epistles; and in that to the Romans on ch. v. 12. he wrote thus, as St. Austin quotes his words <sup>f</sup>:

‘ They that are against the derivation of sin [or ‘ original sin], endeavour to disprove it thus; “ If ‘ Adam's sin,” say they, “ hurts those that do not ‘ sin themselves, then Christ's righteousness may

<sup>d</sup> Gennadius de Scriptoribus, cap. 42.

<sup>e</sup> August. de Peccato orig. cap. 21. [§. 23. Op. tom. x. p. 262.]

<sup>f</sup> De Peccator. Meritis, lib. iii. cap. 2, 3. [Op. tom. x. p. 71, 72.]



CHAP. ' profit those that do not believe : for," he says, " they  
 XIX. ' are as much, nay more, saved by one, than they  
 (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> ' were before dead by one."

' And then say they, " If baptism does cleanse  
 ' that old offence, [or, take away original sin,] then  
 ' they that are born of parents both baptized, must  
 ' be without this sin, for the parents could not  
 ' transmit that which they had not."

" " This also," say they, " may be added ; if the  
 ' soul be not by propagation, but the flesh only,  
 ' then that only has original sin, and that only de-  
 ' serves punishment. For it is unjust," say they,  
 " " that a soul created but to-day, and that not out  
 ' of the mass of Adam, should bear the burden of  
 ' another person's sin committed so long ago."

' They say also, " That it ought by no means to  
 ' be granted, that God, who forgives us our own sins,  
 ' should impute to us other people's." '

Then St. Austin adds ; ' You see Pelagius put all  
 ' this into his writings, not in his own name, but in  
 ' the name of others ; being so satisfied that this  
 ' was a novelty, which but now began to make a  
 ' noise against the old and settled opinion of the  
 ' church, that he was ashamed or afraid to own it  
 ' himself. And perhaps he is not of that opinion  
 ' himself, that a person is born without sin, to whom  
 ' he confesses baptism (in which remission of sins is  
 ' granted) to be necessary.' And a little after, hav-  
 ing shewn how contrary this opinion is to scrip-  
 ture, he says, ' I believe, a man that is so excellent  
 ' a Christian, does not at all hold these and the  
 ' other absurdities that are so perverse and contrary  
 ' to Christian truth.'

312. This St. Austin says in a book written anno

Domini 412, several years after Pelagius had wrote his Exposition on the Epistles. So that he had not even then absolutely declared himself, at least St. Austin did not know that he had. But afterward, as St. Austin says in a later book, ‘being become a heretic, he maintained these same things with a most resolute obstinacy<sup>g</sup>.’

V. Anno Dom. 410, Rome was taken and sacked by the Goths. Then, or quickly after, Pelagius and Cælestius, who during their living there had privately sowed the seeds of this heresy, departed from thence. They are found to have been both in Africa in the year 411. Pelagius went quickly from thence into the east countries<sup>h</sup>. Cælestius stayed there, and attempted to take priest’s orders in the church of Carthage. But some of the clergy of that church, having heard something of his tenets, insisted that he should be first examined about them. So at an assembly or council held there, anno 412, he was<sup>312</sup> challenged by Paulinus, a deacon of that church, as having maintained several false doctrines, and among the rest these four :

1. ‘That Adam was created mortal, and that whether he had sinned or not, he would have died.

2. ‘That the sin of Adam hurt himself only, and not mankind.

3. ‘That infants new born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall.

4. ‘That a man may be without sin, and keep the commandments of God easily, if he will.’

I had occasion to set down the acts of the council, which contain the accusations and his answers to

CHAP.  
XIX.

(A.D. 410.)

<sup>g</sup> Retractat. lib. 2. c. 33. [Op. tom. i. p. 53.]

<sup>h</sup> Augustin. de Gestis Pelagii, c. 22. [Op. tom. x. p. 216.]

CHAP. them, above in ch. v. §. 8. If the reader turn back  
 XIX. thither, he will see the substance of them to be, that  
 he would not own original sin, though he did not  
 (A.D. 410.) then absolutely deny it: but infant-baptism he confessed to be necessary, and that he had never held otherwise.

He also then put in his plea in writing, (a libellus St. Austin calls it, or confession of his belief,) in which he confessed, ‘ That infants have redemption ‘ by the baptism of Christ,’ (as the bishops in a  
 316. council, that was held there five years after, do mention in their letter to Innocent<sup>i</sup>.) From which concession St. Austin (who was not at that council) afterward argued, ‘ By that word *redemption*, he ‘ has stopped up his way [for any farther denial of ‘ original sin]; for, from what are they redeemed, but ‘ from the power of Satan<sup>k</sup>?’ &c.

The issue of the council was, Cælestius was refused, and all that held such opinions condemned. And he went from Carthage, saying, that he would refer himself to Innocent, bishop of Rome; which he never found it for his purpose to do.

312. VI. About this time, anno 412, St. Austin wrote his first treatise against those that held these opinions, (who were afterward called Pelagians; as yet Pelagius himself, though he had set them on foot, did not declare himself: and when St. Austin mentions him in this book, it is with respect, and hoping he would not maintain them). They were much

<sup>i</sup> Epist. Synodic. Concilii Carthag. ad Innocent. apud Augustin. Ep. 90. [epist. 175. Op. tom. ii. p. 617. and in the Appendix to tom. x. p. 91, among various documents relating to the Pelagian history.]

<sup>k</sup> Ep. 89. ad Hilarium. [ep. 157. tom. ii. p. 542.]



talked of at Carthage, where Pelagius and Cælestius had been: and Marcellinus, a nobleman living at that city, sent to St. Austin to desire his resolution of the difficulties raised about them. It was in answer to that desire that he wrote two books, and a little after a third book, (or epistle,) entitled, ‘Of the guilt and forgiveness of sins, and of the baptism of infants<sup>1</sup>.’ The scope of them is to prove the doctrine of original sin to be true, and that chiefly from the baptism of infants; and to assert the necessity of God’s grace, and to answer the objections.

C H A P.  
XIX.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D.410.)

In the first, he discourses of the state of Adam before and after his fall, shews that his seed do derive sin from him, not by imitation only, (as these men explained the Scripture sayings,) but by propagation: that this propagated corruption is in all persons, even in infants that have no actual sin.

He proves this, first by texts of Scripture, then by other arguments; and, among the rest, by this, that infants are by all Christians acknowledged to stand in need of baptism, which must be in them for original sin, since they have no other. He mentions and replies to some answers which the deniers of original sin gave to this last argument, which pressed them very hard.

1. Some said, that infants have actual sin: meaning their peevishness, &c., and that they may have need to be baptized for that<sup>m</sup>. These men he judges unworthy of any answer here, as arguing against plain sense: yet at the end of the book he spends some time in answering them.

VII. 2. Some said, they are baptized, not for

[Op. tom. x. p. 1, &c.]

<sup>m</sup> Cap. 17.

CHAP. XIX. 'forgiveness of sin,' but that they may be made  
 'heirs of the kingdom of heaven<sup>n</sup>.' It is to be noted,  
 (A.D. 410.<sup>310</sup>) the Pelagians held a middle state between heaven  
 and hell. 'These men,' says St. Austin, 'if they be  
 'asked whether infants not baptized, and not made  
 'heirs of the kingdom, have yet the benefit of  
 'eternal salvation at the resurrection of the dead,  
 'laborant vehementer, nec exitum inveniunt, are at  
 'a great plunge, and can find no way out of it.  
 'Quis enim Christianorum ferat, cum dicitur ad  
 'æternam salutem posse quenquam pervenire, si  
 'non renascatur in Christo, quod per baptismum  
 'fieri voluit?' &c. 'For what Christian man can  
 'endure to hear it said, that any person may come  
 'to eternal salvation, that is not regenerated in  
 'Christ, which he has ordered to be done by bap-  
 'tism?' &c.

And whereas these men distinguish between salvation and the kingdom of heaven, and said, children might be saved without baptism, though not come to the kingdom of heaven; he brings in that text, Tit. iii. 5, *He saved us by the washing of regeneration*, &c. As he does in a following chapter that of St. Peter, 1 Epist. iii. 21, *Baptism doth save us*. He proceeds, 'Who dares to affirm  
 'that infants may be saved without that regenera-  
 'tion, as if Christ had not died for them? For  
 'Christ died for sinners; and if these, who, it is  
 'plain, have committed no sin in their own life,  
 'are not held captive under the original bond of sin  
 'neither; how did Christ, who died for sinners, die  
 'for them? If they are not diseased with any sick-  
 'ness of original sin, why are they carried to Christ

<sup>n</sup> Cap. 18.

‘ the Physician, to receive the sacrament of their CHAP.  
 ‘ eternal salvation, by the godly fear of their friends XIX.  
 ‘ that run with them to it? Why is it not said to (A.D. 410.)  
 ‘ them in the church, “ Carry back from hence these  
 ‘ innocent creatures: the whole have no need of a  
 ‘ physician, but they that are sick: Christ came not  
 ‘ to call the righteous, but sinners?” *Nunquam*  
 ‘ *dictum est, nunquam dicitur, nunquam omnino di-*  
 ‘ *cetur in ecclesia Christi tale commentum.* So odd  
 ‘ a thing never was said, never is said, nor ever will  
 ‘ be said, in the church of Christ.’

Concerning what was then said, or what had ever been said, St. Austin was a proper judge: but we find now, that for what would be said in after-times, he did not guess altogether right; if he meant that no Christians would ever say so.

Then he answers the objections of those who said, if infants were sinners, it were needful for them to repent; which since they cannot do, it is a sign that baptism is not in their case used for forgiveness of sin. His answer is, ‘ That in like manner as they profess faith by the words of those  
 ‘ that bring them, they do also go for penitents,  
 ‘ when by the words of the same bearers, they do  
 ‘ renounce the devil and the world.’

Whereas they objected<sup>p</sup>, if all infants are sinful, what justice is it that some should happen to have baptism, and so be forgiven; and others, no more sinful than they, should miss it, and so be condemned? He desires them to answer first, if all infants are sinless, what justice is it that some should happen to have baptism, and so be admitted into the kingdom of heaven: and others, as sinless as

<sup>o</sup> Cap. 19.<sup>p</sup> Cap. 21.



CHAP. XIX. they should miss it, and so be excluded? he teaches that all such things are to be referred to the unsearchable wisdom of God.

(A.D.<sup>310</sup>.<sub>410</sub>.)

VIII. He refutes<sup>q</sup> those that, knowing not what else to say, ventured upon the exploded opinion of Plato and Origen; that the souls of infants have lived before in another state or world, and have sinned there: and so pleaded that possibly it is for those sins that they are here baptized. He stops their mouths with that scripture, Rom. ix. 11. *The children being not yet born, having done neither good nor evil, &c.*, and with several other arguments: but that one is enough.

Having occasionally said<sup>r</sup> that infants, till they are baptized, do *abide in darkness*; he recites an objection of some, that all that are born are enlightened, from that text<sup>s</sup>, *That was the true light that lighteth every man* [or person] *that cometh into the world*. Whereupon he says, ‘if that be so: it is a  
‘strange thing that they being enlightened by the  
‘only Son, who was in the beginning with God,  
‘God the word, should not be admitted into the  
‘kingdom of God, nor be heirs of God, nor joint-  
‘heirs with Christ. For that this is not granted  
‘them but by baptism, even they that are of this  
‘opinion do confess.’

IX. He cites abundance of places<sup>t</sup> of scripture to shew that all that Christ came to save, as Mediator, are by the scripture supposed to have been in a lost condition: he came, he took flesh, he submitted himself to the form of a servant, died, &c., that he might quicken those that were dead, save those that were

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 22.

<sup>r</sup> Cap. 25.

<sup>s</sup> John i. 9.

<sup>t</sup> Cap. 26, 27.

lost, free those that were in slavery, redeem those  
 that were in captivity, enlighten those that were in  
 darkness, rescue those that were under the power of  
 Satan, &c. From whence he says it follows, ‘ that  
 ‘ they do not belong to this dispensation of Christ,  
 ‘ fulfilled by his humiliation, who have no need of  
 ‘ life, salvation, deliverance, redemption, &c. And  
 ‘ consequently baptism is not necessary for those  
 ‘ who have no need of the benefit of forgiveness and  
 ‘ reconciliation by the Mediator. “ Porro quia par-  
 ‘ vulos baptizandos esse concedunt, qui contra auc-  
 ‘ toritatem universæ ecclesiæ, proculdubio per do-  
 ‘ minum et apostolos traditam, venire non possunt,”  
 ‘ &c. Now then, since they grant that infants must  
 ‘ be baptized, as not being able to oppose the author-  
 ‘ ity of the whole church, which was doubtless de-  
 ‘ livered by our Lord and his apostles ; they must  
 ‘ consequently grant, that they stand in need of the  
 ‘ benefits of the Mediator : that being offered by the  
 ‘ sacrament and by the charity of the faithful, and  
 ‘ so being incorporated into Christ’s body, they may  
 ‘ be reconciled to God : that in him they may be  
 ‘ quickened, saved, delivered, redeemed, enlightened.  
 ‘ From what, but from death, wickedness, guilt,  
 ‘ slavery, and darkness of sins ? Which since they  
 ‘ have committed none in their own life at that age,  
 ‘ there remains [nothing that they can be guilty of  
 ‘ but] original sin.’

X. He disputes largely<sup>u</sup> against their opinion of a  
 ‘ middle state, proving, ‘ That there is no salvation  
 ‘ but in the kingdom of God ;——nor any middle  
 ‘ place where any one can be, except with the Devil,  
 ‘ who is not with Christ. Hence our lord himself,

<sup>u</sup> Cap. 28.

CHAP. XIX.  
 310.  
 (A.D. 410.) ‘ that he might rase out of the minds of mistaken  
 ‘ men any opinion of I know not what middle state,  
 ‘ which some men go about to attribute to unbap-  
 ‘ tized infants ; as that they shall, being sinless, be  
 ‘ in eternal life, but not being baptized, shall not be  
 ‘ with Christ in his kingdom ; gave this definitive  
 ‘ sentence to stop their mouths, *He that is not with*  
 ‘ *me is against me.* Give us therefore an infant :  
 ‘ if he be with Christ already, what is he baptized  
 ‘ for ? But if, as the truth is, he be therefore bap-  
 ‘ tized, that he may be with Christ, then it is sure  
 ‘ that before he is baptized he is not with Christ.’

Though St. Austin here in the heat of this dispute do once use this expression, of unbaptized infants being with the Devil, since by the Pelagians’ confession they are not with Christ ; yet he means but a very moderate degree of condemnation or misery : not like that of wicked men ; but such as may be preferable to no being at all. As I shall shew hereafter<sup>x</sup>.

He goes on<sup>y</sup> to prove his point from the name or title given by our Saviour to baptism, John iii. 5, *Except one be born again* [or regenerated], &c., he says ; ‘ these men, if they were not moved [or ‘ convinced] by this sentence, would determine that ‘ infants are not to be baptized at all.’ And he argues, ‘ why born again, but to be renewed ? Renewed ‘ from what, but from the old nature, *a vetustate* ? ‘ From what old nature, but that wherein our old ‘ nature is crucified with him, that the body of sin ‘ might be destroyed<sup>z</sup> ?’

He confirms the same sense by the following parts

<sup>x</sup> Part ii. ch. 6. §. 5.      <sup>y</sup> Cap. 30, 31, &c.      <sup>z</sup> Rom. vi. 6.



of our Saviour's discourse with Nicodemus<sup>a</sup>, *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, i. e. as St. Austin takes it, is corrupt or sinful. *And that which is born of the Spirit is spirit*, i. e. is renewed or sanctified. CHAP.  
XIX.  

---

(A.D. 410.)

XI. He takes notice<sup>b</sup>, that those particular men at Carthage, of whom Marcellinus had wrote to him, did grant, 'that in baptism there is forgiveness of sins given to infants; not that they have any original sin, but they have sinned since they were born.' He takes notice how much these differ from the others, whom he had been hitherto refuting, and one of whose books he had seen. 'The one,' says he, 'minding the scriptures, and the authority of the whole church, and the form of the sacrament itself, see well that baptism in infants is for remission of sins; but cannot see, or will not own, that it is original sin. The other, considering human nature,—see well, as it is easy to do, that that age cannot in its own life have contracted any sin; but rather than confess original sin, say there is no sin at all in infants.' He bids these two parties first agree among themselves: for if each grant to the other that which they urge of truth, they will both hold the whole truth.

However, he does condescend<sup>c</sup> for the sake of these latter, to shew at large how impossible it is for a new-born infant, that has no knowledge of good or evil, to be guilty of actual sin. But it seems a flat and needless discourse: because, as he there observes, 'A man is never more troubled to find what

<sup>a</sup> John iii. 6.<sup>b</sup> Cap. 34.<sup>c</sup> Cap. 35.

CHAP. 'to say, than when the thing he would prove is of  
XIX. 'itself plainer than any thing he can say.'

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.) What we can observe out of these passages of the first book (besides what has been observed before) is the tenet of Pelagius and his followers. They denied original sin. The catholics, among other arguments against them, urged this; that infants have sin, is proved from the need they have of baptism: and other than original sin they cannot have. The Pelagians did not pretend to deny the necessity of infant-baptism: which had been highly for their purpose to do, if they had thought they could have justified such a denial. And when St. Austin mentions it as a practice of the whole church from the apostles' time; they do not deny it, but own it as we shall see hereafter: only they said, baptism, in the case of an infant, is not for 'forgiveness of sin,' (though they were driven from this hold too afterward, as we shall see,) but to procure the child an 'entrance into the kingdom of heaven.' For they held that an infant, dying unbaptized, shall be raised again, and live eternally in a certain middle state, without punishment, as having no sin; but not enjoying the kingdom of heaven, as being not baptized into Christ. But that a baptized infant shall go into the kingdom of heaven.

XII. As for that plea, that infants have actual sin, and are baptized for that; it was the tenet only of some ignorant persons among them, whom Marcellinus had mentioned. Pelagius and Cælestius did not stand to that; but they held for a while stiff in their refusal to own baptism of infants to be for forgiveness.

Cælestius had, as I said before, used the word *redemption* as applied to infants by their baptism. CHAP.  
XIX.  
And the same thing St. Austin observes here<sup>d</sup>, ‘they 310.  
(A.D. 410.)  
‘grant redemption to be necessary for them, as is  
‘contained in a very short book of one of them,  
‘who yet would not plainly express there the for-  
‘givenness of any sin.’ And again<sup>e</sup>, ‘though they  
‘have not been willing in their writings plainly to  
‘own forgiveness of sins to be necessary for infants,  
‘yet they have owned redemption to be needful for  
‘them.’

XIII. The second book of this work is on another subject, viz. St. Austin’s resolution of this question, put to him by Marcellinus, ‘whether there is, or  
‘ever was, or ever will be, any man without sin,  
‘beside our Saviour Christ.’

As the Pelagians denied the original corruption of our nature, so accordingly they magnified the present freedom and goodness of it: and some at this time went so far, or as St. Austin here expresses it<sup>f</sup>, ‘presumed so much on the freedom of man’s  
‘will, as to be of opinion, that we have no need to  
‘be assisted by God to avoid sin, after he has once  
‘granted to our nature the power of freewill.’ In confuting this opinion of theirs he has not much occasion to speak of infant-baptism. So I should pass it by; but the indignation to see the ancient fathers so misrepresented as they are by some modern writers<sup>g</sup>, (with what intent they do this God knows,) forces me to give in short the substance of his answer to this question; that it may appear how falsely he and St. Hierome are charged to con-

<sup>d</sup> Cap. 34.

<sup>e</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 36.

<sup>f</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 2.

<sup>g</sup> [See above, p. 350.]



CHAP. tradict one another in the substantial part of their  
XIX. answer,

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.) St. Austin divides this question into four<sup>h</sup>:

1. Whether the thing be possible, viz. for a man to live without sin?

To this he answers, ‘I shall confess it to be possible by the grace of God, and the freewill of man:’ explaining himself so, as that God can, if he please, give such a measure of grace, as that a man should ever choose and do what is best.

2. Whether this do ever come to pass?

*Answ.* ‘I do not believe there is any such thing; I rather believe the scripture, which says, *Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified*<sup>i</sup>.’ Here he produces many texts proving all men to be sinners.

3. If it be possible so to be, and yet never be so; what is the reason?

*Answ.* ‘I might answer easily and truly thus; because men will not. But if I am asked why they will not? there is a great deal to be said. Yet leaving room for a more diligent inquiry, I shall answer to this also in short. Men will not do what is good, either because they are not convinced that it is good, or because it does not please them<sup>k</sup>.’

4. Whether there be, or ever can be, a man that has never had any sin?

He answers, no; because, suppose any man should by God’s grace arrive to that perfection as not to sin any more; yet having been conceived in sin, it will be true of him that he had sins before he was converted to that newness of life<sup>l</sup>.

<sup>h</sup> Cap. 6.

<sup>i</sup> Cap. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Cap. 17.

<sup>l</sup> Cap. 20.

He proves these his answers largely, and answers C H A P.  
XIX.  
the objections raised from 1 John v. 18. *He that is*  
*born of God sinneth not*; and from what is said of (A.D. 310.  
410.)  
Job, and of Zacharias and Elizabeth being blameless,  
upright, &c.

And whereas this sort of men did use to catch and baffle the people with such logical quirks as these, ‘Si nolumus, non peccamus:’ ‘We do not sin ‘whether we will or no:’ and, ‘possibilia Deus ‘mandata dedit, aut impossibilia<sup>1</sup>,’ &c. ‘The things ‘that God has set us to do, are either possible ‘things, or impossible. If possible, we may per- ‘form them if we will; if impossible, then we are ‘in no fault for not doing impossible things.’ From whence they concluded that it was certainly true, which they maintained, ‘That a man may be with- ‘out sin, and keep God’s commandments easily, if ‘he will.’

St. Austin answers thus, ‘They seem to them- ‘selves witty when they say (as if any of us did ‘not know that) that we do not sin whether we ‘will or no; and that God would never command a ‘man that which is impossible to human will. But ‘they do not see, that to overcome some things ‘which are either corruptly desired or corruptly ‘feared, there is occasion for the strong, and some- ‘times the utmost effort of the will [or resolution] ‘which he foresaw we should not perfectly exert ‘in all cases, who would have it truly foretold by ‘the prophet, *In thy sight shall no man living be ‘justified.*’

XIV. I recite this, to shew that the grounds on

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dialog. contra Pelagianos, lib. i. [sect. 10. et 21; Op. tom. ii. p. 688.]

CHAP. which St. Austin opposed this presumptuous doctrine, are not different from those on which St.

XIX.  
(A.D.<sup>310</sup>.410.) Hierome did; as the author I spake of before would make us believe<sup>m</sup>. For the answer given by St. Hierome to the same cavils, is this; he had recited the objection about possible and impossible: he had shewed that some men that are commendable for one quality, are faulty for another; and that none is perfect in all. Then to the dilemma he answers, ‘They are possible things which God has commanded, I own it; but even for these possible things we cannot every one of us have all of them; and this, not by reason of the weakness [or inability] of nature, that you may not rail; but because of the weariness of the mind, which cannot have all virtues together and keep them always. And if you will reproach the Creator for that, because he has made you such a creature as does flag or grow weary, I will tell you again, it will be a smarter reprehension of him if you find fault with him that he has not made you a god. But you will say, “If I cannot do it, I am in no sin.” You are in a sin. Why could not you do that which another could do? And again, he, in comparison of whom you are worse, will be a sinner himself in comparison of some other, or of you in some other quality<sup>n</sup>.’

This is the saying of St. Hierome, which that writer instances in<sup>o</sup> as contrary to St. Austin’s doctrine, but proves it no other way than by shewing that Pelagius (whom he takes to be St. Austin) rails

<sup>m</sup> §. 2. p. 352.

<sup>n</sup> Dial. 1. [sect. 23. tom. ii. p. 706.]

<sup>o</sup> Bibliothèque Univ. tom. viii. p. 219.



against it. The answers of the one and of the other of these fathers are for substance the same, viz. CHAP.  
XIX.  
That though it be, logically speaking, true, which (A.D. 310.  
410.)  
the Pelagians urged, ‘that we may do all that we ‘can do,’ (the denial of it being a contradiction,) yet there is no man living but at some times he is slothful or weary, or not so watchful against sin and passion, as he himself will confess afterward he might have been. And this comes upon a man in spite of the firmest resolution he can have settled beforehand.

The same author in the same treatise represents the tenets of Pelagius and St. Austin very partially; and after such a manner as if St. Austin had produced no other proof against Pelagius of the need we all stand in of God’s assisting grace in order to live well, than what was fetched from the doctrine of absolute and particular predestination. ‘The ‘difference then,’ says he<sup>p</sup>, ‘between St. Austin and ‘Pelagius in this matter was this, that the first ‘believed that since the sin of Adam his posterity ‘are so corrupted, that they are born with such ‘dispositions to evil, as do necessarily carry them ‘to sin; that if God will bring any one to good, ‘he must for every good action give him a grace, ‘which shall inevitably make him will that which ‘is good. And for the rest, those to whom he does ‘not give such a grace are damned. God, by a ‘wisdom which we understand not, having a mind ‘that mankind should be born under an inevitable ‘necessity of sinning, and of being accordingly tor- ‘mented with eternal punishments, without deliver- ‘ing from this doleful necessity any more than a

<sup>p</sup> Bibliothèque Univ. tom. viii. p. 195.

CHAP. 'very small number of persons to whom he gives an  
XIX. 'invincible grace.'

(A.D.<sup>310.</sup>410.) Now besides that the opinion of St. Austin concerning predestination is here very invidiously and disadvantageously represented, and that of Pelagius is as much smoothed over; what an unfair account is it of the controversy between them, to make it turn upon that point? St. Austin brought many other proofs and reasons in this dispute, such as are owned to be valid, not only by those that approve the opinion he held about predestination, but by those that dislike it. God forbid all should be Pelagians that have not the same conceptions that St. Austin had about that other matter; Pelagianism has been accounted an heretical doctrine in all ages of the church, and in all particular churches; even in those in which the doctrine of predestination has been variously explained. It is one thing thankfully to own the assistance of God's Spirit in all the good purposes and spiritual strength we have; and another to determine that God limits this grace and assistance to a certain number of particular persons, or gives it in an irresistible degree. Or, to speak plainly, there is a great difference between the Arminian and the Pelagian tenets. Concerning the first, most men are now agreed to bear with one another in any difference about them: but they that would obliterate the doctrine of original sin, and of the necessity of God's grace, we know not whither they would lead us, nor what part of our religion they will leave us.

The Arminians or Remonstrants did, at the synod of Dort, exhibit an account of their tenets in this matter, wherein they frankly confess God's grace to

be necessary, not only as it illuminates our understanding, but also ‘voluntati vires conferat ad non  
‘peccandum,’ ‘it gives strength to the will to avoid  
‘sin:’ and not only to teach us what we ought to do,  
but also, ‘ut quod factu opus est, facere diligamus et  
‘valeamus,’ ‘that we may be able to do, and may  
‘love to do, that which we ought:’ which was the  
thing required of Pelagius to confess, and on the  
owning whereof he would have been acquitted.  
They do also shew how far they differ from the  
Pelagians (and even from the Semi-pelagians) in all  
those other things for which either of the said  
parties were condemned by the church of that time.  
This they do in the declaration of their tenet on  
the third and fourth of the five articles<sup>q</sup>. What then  
makes this man (who professes that way) to talk of  
Pelagianism as if it were so tacked to Arminianism  
that St. Austin could not confute the one without  
confuting the other? And to represent St. Hierome,  
who confuted Pelagius without having recourse to  
St. Austin’s opinion of predestination, as a Semi-  
pelagian<sup>r</sup>?

XV. Whereas the chief point on which Pelagius  
was condemned, was his denial of any such thing  
as an internal grace of God’s Spirit moving and in-  
clining the heart to faith, love, obedience, &c., which  
we ought to pray to God for: this historian, citing  
Petavius<sup>s</sup> for it, reckons up six sorts of grace which

<sup>q</sup> Acta et Scripta Synodalia Dordracena Ministrorum Remonstrantium, &c. Herderwici, 1620. pt. ii. p. 22, &c.

<sup>r</sup> Biblioth. Univ. tom. viii. p. 194.

<sup>s</sup> [De Pelagianorum et Semi-pelagianorum dogmatum historia, cap. 2. sect. 4. See Petavii Dogmata theologica, fol. Antwerpiaë, 1700, tom. iii. p. 305.]



CHAP. Pelagius owned. 1. God's grace in giving us a free-  
 XIX.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ will: and, 2. In giving a sinner pardon for sins  
 (A.D.<sup>310.</sup>410.) past, to encourage him: and, 3. In giving his law:  
 and, 4. The grace of baptism, wherein an adult  
 person that has sinned, obtains remission of sins,  
 and the inheritance of God's kingdom: an infant  
 has no remission of sins, as having no sin in his  
 opinion, but yet is put into a better state, being  
 made an heir of God's kingdom: and, 5. In giving  
 the kingdom of heaven as a reward to encourage us.  
 These five nobody accused him of denying. But  
 here<sup>t</sup> he is said to have owned another sort of grace,  
 viz. 'The internal illumination of our spirit,' which  
 Pelagius expresses in this wise:

'I confess that grace consists not only in the law,  
 'but in God's assistance: for God assists us by his  
 'doctrine and his revelation, in opening the eyes of  
 'our hearts; in declaring to us the things that shall  
 'be hereafter, that we may not be fixed to the pre-  
 'sent things; in discovering to us the snares of the  
 'Devil; in enlightening us by the manifold and un-  
 'speakable gift of his heavenly grace. Does he that  
 'speaks thus, think you, deny the grace of God?  
 'Does he not confess at once both God's grace and  
 'man's freewill<sup>u</sup>?'

It is true, St. Austin does quote these and such  
 other words out of Pelagius' third book of freewill.  
 But he shews at the same place, that they are used  
 by him only for a blind, and that his other sayings  
 in the same book are such as will not suffer these  
 to be understood in a catholic sense. Both St.  
 Hierome and St. Austin give this account of him,

<sup>t</sup> Biblioth. Univ. tom. viii. p. 198.

<sup>u</sup> De Gratia Christi, lib. i. c. 7. [Op. tom. x. p. 233.]

(which they prove by several instances,) that though he held those singular opinions, and propagated them privately in the minds of his followers, yet he was very unwilling to be convicted of so doing; and therefore used in his writings a great deal of equivocation. He would say such things as looked like an owning of internal grace; but still would take care to place his words so as that he could, when occasion required, explain them to mean only that grace or mercy of God, by which he gives us good rules, doctrines, revelations, promises, &c. And so here he limits (as St. Austin observes) all that he speaks of, to doctrine and revelation; and he does not name it *internal*, as Mr. Le Clerc does.

C H A P.  
XIX.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.)

St. Austin shews him to have used the same artifice through all his four books of ‘Freewill;’ which he wrote on purpose to vindicate his reputation: and yet even there he never spoke home to the owning of God’s grace in the catholic sense, but often to the denying of it. He says there, in the same book out of which the foresaid specious words are quoted<sup>x</sup>, ‘We distinguish between these three things, and place them each in their due order; in the first place we rank *posse*, the power of doing any thing; in the second, *velle*, the will to do it; in the third, *esse*, the being of the thing. We say the power is in our nature; the will, *in arbitrio*, in our choice; the being, in the effect. The first, i. e. the power, properly belongs to God, who has given it to his creature; but the other two, i. e. the will and the being, are to be referred to the man, because they come from the fountain of freewill.’

<sup>x</sup> Pelagius pro libero Arbitrio, lib. iii. apud August. de Gratia Christi, lib. i. cap. 4.

CHAP.  
XIX.

And in another place<sup>y</sup>, he says by way of objection to his own assertion :

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.)

*Obj.* ‘ But how then shall that of the apostle stand good, *It is God that worketh in you both to will and to do<sup>z</sup> ?*’

*Ans.* ‘ He worketh in us to will that which is good, to will that which is holy ; inasmuch as, by the greatness of the future glory, and his promise of reward, he encourages us, who are given to earthly desires, and do love only things before our eyes as brute beasts ; inasmuch as he raises our drowsy will by the revelation of his wisdom ; inasmuch as he advises us to every good thing,’ &c.

All this St. Austin shews to be far short of what was necessary for him to say, if he would clear himself, because it makes God to work upon our wills only outwardly by proposals : and says, ‘ Let him once at last own that grace, by which the greatness of the future glory is not only promised to us, but believed and hoped for by us ; and by which his wisdom is not only revealed to us, but loved by us ; and by which *non suadet solum omne quod bonum est, verum et persuadetur*, we are not only advised to every good thing, but prevailed on to follow it.’ Then having commented upon that text<sup>a</sup>, *No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me, draw him* : he adds, ‘ this sort of grace Pelagius ought to own, if he have a mind not only to be called, but to be, a Christian.’

But the event proved, that he would never own that sort of grace ; and that the latent meaning of all his coloured speeches was no other than what St. Austin, and his other opponents, took it to be,

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. cap. 10.

<sup>z</sup> Phil. iii. 12.

<sup>a</sup> John vi. 44.



For when so much offence was taken at him, that nothing was to be expected but excommunication; CHAP.  
XIX.  
Cælestius and he being then in the East, applied (A.D. 410.<sup>310.</sup>)  
themselves to the church of Rome, to see if the apology they made for themselves would pass there. Cælestius came in person, and delivered in a confession of his faith: Pelagius came not, but sent one, (of which I shall by and by give a copy,) and a letter with it. There happened to be then a weak bishop of that church, Zosimus, who was for the present so far imposed on by their pretences, and was so incompetent a judge of this question, and of the other about original sin, (as I shew more particularly <sup>b</sup> hereafter,) that he took what they said for orthodox, and blamed their accusers as having slandered them; though his predecessor Innocent had declared an ill opinion of them. But the African <sup>317.</sup>  
bishops, being then in council at Carthage, sent their synodical epistle to Zosimus, advertising him of the craft and equivocation used by those men; and shewing by instances, wherein his examination of them was short of what it ought to have been: and that Cælestius ought particularly to recant the erroneous positions in his confession. Upon the coming of this letter, when Cælestius was summoned to appear <sup>c</sup>, ‘That by his direct and plain answer either  
‘ his hypocrisy or else his amendment might be  
‘ made manifest, and be no longer ambiguous; he  
‘ withdrew himself, and would not come to the hear-  
‘ ing.’ So far St. Austin’s words are: but Mercator

<sup>b</sup> §. 33.

<sup>c</sup> August. contra duas Epistolas] Pelagianorum, lib. ii. c. 3.  
[Op. tom. x. p. 433.]

CHAP. gives this further circumstance<sup>d</sup>, that he ran away  
XIX. from Rome.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.) This passage of the history Mr. Le Clerc leaves out, which none that pretended to write this history ever left out before; for it is a plain proof that the opinion against the grace of God, which the catholics charged the Pelagians with, was their real opinion; and not wrongfully affixed on them by taking their words in a worse sense than they meant them, as he would have it believed.

318. The issue was, the bishops of Africa continued in their resolution, and the next year sent a peremptory letter to Zosimus, (who had done all he could to have these men acquitted,) that they did determine, *Constituimus*<sup>e</sup>, &c. ‘That the sentence pronounced against Pelagius and Cælestius, by the ‘reverend bishop Innocent, from the see of the ‘blessed apostle Peter, do stand firm, so long till ‘they do by a plain confession own that we are in ‘every action assisted by the grace of God through ‘our Lord Jesus Christ, not only to understand, but ‘also to practise righteousness; in such wise as that ‘without it we are not able to do, to speak, to think, ‘or to have any thing of true and sincere piety.’ And Zosimus at last complied with them, and joined in giving the same sentence: and so, as Prosper tells us<sup>f</sup>, did all the world.

<sup>d</sup> [Marii Mercatoris Commonitorium super nomine Pelagii, Cælestii, et Juliani, eorumque hæresi, cap. i. This work is printed in the collection of Councils, ed. Labbe, ii. p. 1512. ed. Mansi, iv. p. 291.]

<sup>e</sup> Prosper contra Cassianum Collatorem, cap. 10. [p. 103, ed. Paris, 1671.]

<sup>f</sup> Chronic. ad ann. 418.

They were, as appears by St. Austin's words <sup>g</sup>, CHAP.  
XII.  
 'either to do penance,' [viz. recant their heretical  
 opinions, whereof this of denying God's grace, and <sup>310.</sup>  
 the other of original sin, were the chief,] 'or, if they (A.D. 410.)  
 'refused that, to stand condemned' [or excommuni-  
 cated]. There were also imperial edicts against  
 them.

XVI. All that we hear of afterwards, that tended <sup>319.</sup>  
 towards recantation, was this: Pinianus, and Al-  
 bina, and Melania, being then in the East, where  
 Pelagius was, wrote to St. Austin, that they 'had  
 'dealt with him <sup>h</sup> to condemn [or recant] under his  
 'hand all the things that were objected to him; and  
 'that [as to God's grace] he hath said in their hear-  
 'ing, thus, "I do anathematize [or renounce] any  
 'one that says or thinks that the grace of God, by  
 'which Christ came into the world to save sinners,  
 'is not necessary both every hour and moment, and  
 'also in every action; and they that take away [or  
 'deny] this grace, are to have [or may they have]  
 'eternal punishment.'"'

But St. Austin in answer <sup>i</sup> shews them, that these  
 words are capable of the same equivocation he was  
 wont to use: that probably by 'the grace of God  
 'by which Christ came to save sinners,' he meant  
 nothing but the 'pardon of sins,' or, the 'example  
 'of Christ,' the consideration of which was always  
 necessary: that he had before in the synod of Dios-<sup>315.</sup>  
 polis said as much as this comes to: for that being  
 there accused of holding, 'that the grace of God is  
 'not given in every action, but does consist in our  
 'freewill, or in the law and doctrine,' and, 'that

<sup>g</sup> De Peccato originali, cap. 22.

<sup>h</sup> Augustin. de Gratia Christi, cap. 2.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. cap. 3.



CHAP. XIX. ‘ the grace of God is given according to our deserts;’  
 and the proof brought against him being this, that  
 (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> Cælestius, who was his disciple, had written such  
 things : he answered, ‘ Whether these are Cælestius’  
 ‘ sayings or not, let them look to it that say they  
 ‘ are his. I never held so, and I do anathematize  
 ‘ any one that holds so.’ And yet that after that,  
 he had in his books of freewill shewn that he had  
 really no other sentiments than such as he seemed  
 then to condemn.

So this did not avail him. He knew well enough  
 what words to have expressed himself in, so as to  
 satisfy the church ; but he would not use them.  
 St. Austin told him<sup>k</sup> that ‘ inasmuch as the question  
 ‘ about reconciling man’s freewill and God’s grace  
 ‘ is so intricate ; that while one is asserted, the  
 ‘ other may seem to be denied ; if he would grant  
 ‘ that God does not only give us a power of doing  
 ‘ well, but does also assist us in the willing and  
 ‘ doing of it, (which by the way, is what I shewed  
 ‘ before that the Remonstrants do, or at least did  
 ‘ freely own,) the controversy would be at an end.’

But he would never say so. He continued ex-  
 communicate, and seems to have lived obscurely all  
 the rest of his time.

After all, it is not material to us, whether he was  
 guilty, or whether his accusers were mistaken in  
 his sense ; (it were to be wished he could have been  
 shewn to have been guiltless,) were it not that some  
 nowadays, that have a mind to set up the same  
 opinions to a much worse purpose than ever Pela-  
 gius did, do go about to retrieve the credit of them  
 by discrediting the catholic church of that time.

<sup>k</sup> Augustin. de Gratia Christi, cap. 47.

That which St. Austin says to Pelagius, on this CHAP. XIX. account of denying God's grace, may be applied to (A.D. 410.) some of them on account (not only of that, but also) 310. of an article of a higher nature, which they are supposed likewise not to believe. 'He has not thought 'fit any where to own that we, when we pray, are 'assisted by God's grace that we may not sin; and 'if he does notwithstanding in his own mind believe 'this, he must pardon those that suspect otherwise: 'for he himself causes this suspicion, who, when 'he lies under so much obloquy on that account, 'will believe this, and yet will not confess it. What 'great matter were it for him to say this, especially 'where he undertakes to handle and explain that 'point, &c.? Why should he there defend nature 'only<sup>1</sup>, &c.?

XVII. I have recited what I mean to do of the dispute concerning God's grace altogether, that it may give no interruption to what remains to be said of the other, concerning original sin, and the occasions thence taken to speak of infant-baptism.

In the third of those books, Of the Guilt and Forgiveness of Sins, and Baptism of Infants, St. Austin having in the foregoing chapters recited several interpretations, of which those texts, Rom. v. 12, 13, 14, &c., are capable, concludes in the fifth chapter, that whichsoever of them be taken, the words 'can have 'no other sense but such an one by which it has 'come to pass that the whole church has from of 'old constantly held that *fidel* (or baptized) infants 'do obtain remission of original sin by the baptism 'of Christ.'

Then he recites a large piece of the epistle of

<sup>1</sup> Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 59. [Op. x. p. 157.]

CHAP. St. Cyprian to Fidus, which I gave a copy of in ch. vi.  
 XIX.  
 (A.D. 310. 410.) and observes how he there takes the doctrine of  
 original sin in infants, for a known and undoubted  
 thing; and by it proves (what was then by Fidus  
 questioned) that an infant may and must be bap-  
 tized before the eighth day, if need require. Then  
 he adds<sup>m</sup>:

‘ And now some people, by the boldness of I know  
 ‘ not what disputing humour, go about to represent  
 ‘ that as uncertain which our ancestors made use of  
 ‘ as a most certain thing whereby to resolve some  
 ‘ things that seemed uncertain. For, when this be-  
 ‘ gan first to be disputed, I know not: but this I  
 ‘ know, that holy Hierome, whose pains and fame  
 ‘ for excellent learning in ecclesiastical matters is at  
 ‘ this day so great, does also make use of this as a  
 ‘ thing most certain, to resolve some questions in  
 ‘ his books,’ &c. Then having quoted some passages  
 out of St. Hierome on Jonah, he proceeds, ‘ If we  
 ‘ could with convenience come to ask that most  
 ‘ learned man, how many writers of Christian dis-  
 ‘ sertations and interpreters of holy scripture in both  
 ‘ languages could he recount, who from the time  
 ‘ that Christ’s church has been founded, have held  
 ‘ no otherwise, have received no other doctrine from  
 ‘ their predecessors, nor left any other to their suc-  
 ‘ cessors? For my part (though my reading is much  
 ‘ less than his) I do not remember that I ever heard  
 ‘ any other thing from any Christians that received  
 ‘ the Old and New Testament, *Non solum in catho-*  
 ‘ *lica ecclesia, verum etiam in qualibet hæresi vel*  
 ‘ *schismate constitutis*: neither from such as were of  
 ‘ the catholic church, nor from such as belonged

<sup>m</sup> Cap. 6. [sect. 12. Op. tom. x. 77.]



‘ to any sect or schism. *Non memini me aliud le-* CHAP.  
‘ *gisse, &c.* I do not remember that I ever read XIX.  
‘ otherwise in any writer that I could ever find (A.D. 310.  
‘ treating of these matters, that followed the canon- 410.)  
‘ cal scriptures, or did mean or did pretend to do so.  
‘ From whence it is that this trouble is started up  
‘ upon us, I know not; but a little while ago, when  
‘ I was there at Carthage, I just cursorily heard  
‘ some transient discourse of some people that were  
‘ talking that infants are not baptized for that rea-  
‘ son that they may receive remission of sins, but  
‘ that they may be sanctified in Christ. Though I  
‘ was something startled at the novelty, yet because  
‘ it was not seasonable then to enter into any dis-  
‘ course against it, and because they were not per-  
‘ sons of any such rank as to be much taken notice  
‘ of; it passed over with me as a thing forgotten,  
‘ or not minded. And lo, now it is a thing main-  
‘ tained against the church with ardent endeavours;  
‘ it is even by writing transmitted to memory; it is  
‘ come to that difficulty that the brethren are fain  
‘ to ask our opinions of the matter; and we find a  
‘ necessity of disputing and writing against it.’

This testimony of St. Austin must needs be looked on as a very considerable evidence. He declares, he never met with any Christian, either churchman or sectary; nor with any writer that owned the scripture, who taught any other doctrine, but that infants are baptized for pardon of sin. Much less then had he known or heard of any that denied that they are to be baptized at all. And they had then, as I observed before, but 300 years to look back to the times of the apostles. And St. Austin, though he speak modestly of himself as to learning, had

CHAP. studied the church history so well, that in a few  
 XIX. years after this, he published that his History of all  
 (A.D. 410.) the Sects or Opinions that were, or had been in  
 Christendom ; out of which I quote some things in  
 another chapter<sup>n</sup>.

XVIII. To that objection of Pelagius, ‘ If baptism do take away original sin, then such children as are born of parents both baptized, must be without that sin ;’ St. Austin answers to this purpose<sup>o</sup>, That an error is often strengthened by putting alien and intricate questions about the matter, which is an easy thing in most matters to do. ‘ Yet,’ says he, ‘ if I had this cause to manage against such men as did either deny that infants are to be baptized, or did say that it is needless to baptize them, for that they being born of *fidel* [or baptized] persons, were necessarily partakers of their parents’ privilege ; then I ought to take more pains in confuting this opinion.’ Such persons (as he shews at large) would have need to be put in mind, that as a circumcised parent begets an uncircumcised son ; and wheat that has been cleansed from the chaff, does, if it be sowed, produce wheat with chaff on it : so a parent that has been spiritually cleansed begets a son that resembles him, not according to that state that he is in by spiritual regeneration, but according to the state he was in by carnal generation.

‘ But now,’ says he<sup>p</sup>, ‘ since we have to do with such as do confess that the children of baptized persons are to be baptized ; how much better is it to say thus to them, You that do affirm that of parents cleansed from the stain of sin, such children should be born as are without sin, how is it that

<sup>n</sup> Ch. 21.    <sup>o</sup> Augustin. de Gratia Christi, cap. 8.    <sup>p</sup> Cap. 9.

‘ you do not mind that at the same rate you might  
 ‘ say that of Christian parents there should be born  
 ‘ Christian children? And then, why do you deter-  
 ‘ mine that they are to be baptized?’

CHAP.  
XIX.

310.  
(A.D. 410.)

XIX. And having afterward<sup>q</sup> on this occasion mentioned that text, 1 Cor. vii. 14, *Now are your children holy, &c.*, he refers to the exposition of it which Pelagius had given, and the like to which he himself had given in a former treatise<sup>r</sup> which I recited before<sup>s</sup>, and says, that it must be understood so, or else in another sense which he there gives, (relating to the forbearance of the use of the marriage-bed during the woman’s uncleanness,) or else in some other sense of which we may not be certain. And then adds,

‘ Illud tamen sine dubitatione tenendum est, quæ-  
 ‘ cunque illa sanctificatio sit, non valere ad Chris-  
 ‘ tianos faciendos, atque ad dimittenda peccata, nisi  
 ‘ Christiana et ecclesiastica institutione sacramentis  
 ‘ efficiantur fideles. Nam nec,’ &c.

‘ But that is to be held without any doubt, that  
 ‘ whatever that holiness [or sanctification] be; it is  
 ‘ not available to the making of them Christians, or  
 ‘ to the pardon of sins, unless they be made fidels  
 ‘ by the institution [or order] of Christ and the  
 ‘ church, and by the sacraments. For neither are  
 ‘ unbelieving husbands or wives, how holy and just  
 ‘ partners soever they have, cleansed from the ini-  
 ‘ quity which keeps them from the kingdom of God,  
 ‘ and brings them to damnation; nor are infants, of

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 12.

<sup>r</sup> De Sermone Domini in Monte, [lib. i. cap. 16. sect. 45. Op. tom. iii. part. 2. p. 185.]

<sup>s</sup> Ch. xv. sect. 2.



CHAP. XIX. 'how holy and just parents soever they come, par-  
 done the guilt of original sin; unless they (i. e.  
 (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> 'the one and the other) be baptized in Christ.'

One may here in short confer together the several comments of the ancients on this text; *The unbelieving husband is sanctified* [or, an unbelieving husband has been sanctified] *by his wife, &c., else were your children unclean; but now they are holy.* They do, most of them, and those the most ancient, make that holiness of the children relate to their baptism, as given, or to be given, before they are actually holy.

296. 1. St. Austin in a former book<sup>t</sup>, interprets, 'has been sanctified, i. e. has been brought to the faith.' And, '*Now are your children holy*, i. e. 'Now are they baptized.' And he there gives the grounds of that interpretation, as may be seen by turning back to the place where I recited it<sup>u</sup>. And here he says again, it must be interpreted so, or else certainly in some such sense as does not make them holy so as to inherit the kingdom, unless they be baptized.
299. 2. He also here recites the explication that Pelagius had given of this text, and says, 'Pelagius, when he wrote on this epistle, expounded it thus: "Exempla jam præcesserant, et virorum quos uxores, et foeminarum quas mariti, lucrificerant Christo, et parvulorum ad quos faciendos Christianos voluntas Christiana etiam unius parentis evicerat<sup>v</sup>." There were by this time examples, both of men whom their wives, and of women

<sup>t</sup> De Sermone Domini in Monte, lib. i. cap. 27.

<sup>u</sup> Ch. xv. sect. 2.

<sup>v</sup> [De Peccat. Meritis &c. lib. iii. cap. 12.]

‘whom their husbands, had gained over to Christ; CHAP.  
‘and of infants, concerning whom the Christian de- XIX.  
‘sire even of one of their parents had prevailed that <sup>310.</sup>  
‘they should be made Christians.’ (A.D. 410.)

He manifestly paraphrases these words [‘now are they holy’] thus, ‘now are they made Christians.’ And, the unbelieving party has been sanctified, i. e. has been gained over to Christ.

The very same explication is, as they say, still extant at this text, in those Commentaries on St. Paul’s Epistles, that go under the name of St. Hierome, but are Pelagius’, only interpolated\*.

3. Tertullian, speaking of the privilege that in-100.  
fants have by being of Christian parents, or of one parent such, says, ‘now are they holy, i. e. designed  
‘for holiness; for otherwise, the apostle knew what  
‘our Lord had determined, *Except one be born of*  
‘*water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the*  
‘*kingdom of God*, that is, he shall not be holy.’  
See the place at large, chap. iv. §. 6.

4. Origen also having an eye to this text in his Comment. in Matth. p. 332, ed. Rothom. 1668<sup>y</sup>, shews how he understood ἡγιάσται here. Ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς ἀμφοτέρων ἀπίστων, ὅτε μὲν ὁ ἀνὴρ, πρότερον πιστεύσας τῷ χρόνῳ, σώζει τὴν γυναῖκα· ὅτε δὲ ἡ γυνὴ ἀρξαμένη, ὕστερόν ποτε πείθει τὸν ἄνδρα. ‘When a  
‘man and his wife are both unbelievers; sometimes  
‘the man believing first in time, saves his wife: and  
‘sometimes the wife believing first, does a while after  
‘persuade her husband.’

He that so paraphrases the man *sanctified*, i. e.

\* [See these in vol. xi. p. 810, &c. of St. Jerome’s works, by Vallarsius.]

<sup>y</sup> [Comment. tom. xiii. §. 28. edit. Benedict.]

CHAP. converted to the Christian religion, could not well  
 XIX. understand the sanctity [or holiness] of the children  
 otherwise than their being baptized into it.

<sup>310.</sup>  
 (A.D. 410.)

293.

5. Paulinus writes to St. Hierome this question,  
 ‘How are they holy, whenas without the gift of  
 ‘the grace [viz. baptism] given them afterward  
 ‘[after their birth] and preserved, they cannot be  
 ‘saved<sup>z</sup>?’

6. St. Hierome for answer refers him to the fore-  
 mentioned resolution of Tertullian, but withal men-  
 tions some other interpretations about legal clean-  
 ness or uncleanness.

And the same father, in his epistle to Læta<sup>a</sup>, a  
 Christian woman, daughter of Albinus a heathen,  
 priest of Jupiter, having mentioned this text, says,  
 it had been verified in her family; for that she who  
 had been born ‘de impari matrimonio,’ ‘of an un-  
 ‘equal marriage,’ i. e. her father a heathen, but her  
 mother being a Christian, ‘the sweetness of the  
 ‘fruit had recompensed for the bitterness of the  
 ‘root; and an ill shrub had sweat forth precious  
 ‘balsam, &c. We have borne [or waited] to good  
 ‘purpose. A holy and Christian family does sanc-  
 ‘tify one unbeliever. He [Albinus himself] is now  
 ‘a candidate of the faith, since he is encompassed  
 ‘with a multitude of his children and grandchild-  
 ‘ren that believe. I fancy that Jupiter himself  
 ‘might have believed, if he had had such kindred.’  
 Since he makes this to be a fulfilling of this text,  
 and the sanctifying of an unbeliever to be the con-  
 verting, or probability of converting him; it is plain  
 he understood it as those foregoing. All these bring

<sup>z</sup> See chap. xviii

<sup>a</sup> Epist. 7. [57. in ed. Benedict.—107. ed. Vallars.]



the baptism of infants into the explication of their holiness. CHAP.  
XIX.

St. Chrysostom says<sup>b</sup> a great deal of clean and unclean, without coming to any particular explication of what he means by it. He says, ‘that the woman might not fear being made unclean by the copulation, the apostle tells her, *the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife,*’ &c. And then having shewn why, though adultery is a reasonable cause of separation, yet idolatry or heathenism is not, he adds, ‘then there is given a proof of this: for on supposition that thou being unclean didst bring forth a child, and that child being not from thee alone, the child would be unclean, or but half clean; and therefore he adds, *else were your children unclean, but now they are holy,* i. e. not unclean. But he uses the word *holy*, by an overreaching expression, that he might further dispel all fear of any such suspicion, viz. of uncleanness.’

This is something obscure: but he seems to make no more out of this text than the antipædobaptists do. Yet it is plain that he could not mean that by this cleanness the children would obtain salvation without baptism; because he so often and so plainly affirms the contrary, as I have shewed in chap. xiv. §. 2.

8. He that made the Commentaries ascribed to St. Ambrose, talks yet more slightly: he says<sup>c</sup>, ‘if the believing party stay with the other, the sign of the cross will be used in the house; and that is a sanctification of it: and that, if the believing party go away, and lie with others, it would be adultery;

<sup>b</sup> In loc [Homil. xix. in 1 Cor. §. 2.—Op. tom. x. p. 262.]

<sup>c</sup> In loc. [Append. ad Op. Ambrosii, tom. ii. p. 134.]

CHAP. XIX. ‘and the children so begotten would be unclean, because they would be bastards.’ He makes St. Paul’s  
 (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> arguing to come to no more than this; let the believing woman stay and sanctify the house and her unbelieving husband with the sign of the cross; for if she go from him, and lie with others, the children so begotten would be bastards. Who doubts it?

I know not at what year to place this author; for these commentaries are pieced out of several authors, some elder, some later. This I believe was a later one.

323. 9. Theodoret explains<sup>d</sup>, ‘the unbelieving party is sanctified, that is, there is hope of their salvation. But, suppose either the man or the woman do persist in unbelief; yet the seed shall be saved.’ These last words he explains as Calvin has since done.

10. He that wrote the *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, that are among the works of Athanasius, explains *holy* by ‘shall be saved.’ But he limits it expressly to such as are baptized. I give his words among the spurious pieces, chap. xxiii. §. 3.

These are all the interpretations of this text, that I know of, given by the ancients.

St. Austin in this book<sup>e</sup> answers one more objection of Pelagius, which is this; if the soul be not derived from the parents, but the body only; how comes the soul to be involved in the guilt of original sin?

He answers, 1. that Pelagius had spoke like a circumspect man, when he put that with an *if*: for that it is an obscure matter, and not to be resolved

<sup>d</sup> In loc. [Op. tom. iii. p. 151. ed. Paris. 1642.]

<sup>e</sup> De Peccatorum Meritis, lib. iii. cap. 10.

from scripture, whether the soul be derived, or be immediately created. And, 2. he bids him answer this question first, ‘ If the soul be not derived, what justice is it that a soul newly created, and void of all guilt, wholly free from all contagion of sin, should in infants suffer several passions and torturings of the body, and, which is more dreadful, the outrage of evil spirits?’ He advises, that since we see this by experience to be so, and yet cannot answer for the reason or justice of it, we should in all such questions remember that we are but men.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.)

Having made so large an abstract of what St. Austin says of this matter in these three books, which were his first work against the Pelagians; I may have liberty to pass by a great many sayings in his following books against them. For it were endless to recite all the passages which we meet with in them speaking of infant-baptism, and proving from it original sin. I shall therefore mention only here and there one, and that only in English, for brevity.

XX. The next year, anno 413, St. Hierome wrote his epistle to Ctesiphon<sup>f</sup>, against that opinion of the Pelagians, which denies the need we have of God’s grace; wherein he mentions not Pelagius by name, but means him when he says, ‘ speak out that which you hold: declare publicly what you talk in private to your disciples.——This is the only heresy that is ashamed to speak openly what it teaches privately. The forwardness of the disciples publishes that which the masters keep in. What they hear in the chambers they proclaim on the housetop.’ He instances in some passages of

<sup>f</sup> Epist. 120. [133. edit. Vallars.]



CHAP. a book published by one of the disciples : which was  
 XIX.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ probably Cælestius ; for Pelagius being of more re-  
 (A.D. <sup>310.</sup> 410.) fined politics, generally forbore to appear himself,  
 and put this Irishman foremost. They called the  
 book Syllogisms ; but St. Hierome says it ought  
 to be called *Solæcisms*. It had in it such sayings as  
 these :

‘ It is in vain that God has given me the power  
 ‘ of freewill, if I cannot put it in practice without  
 ‘ his continual help.’

‘ I do either use the power once given me, so as  
 ‘ that freewill is preserved : or else, if I stand in need  
 ‘ of another’s help, the freedom of will is destroyed  
 ‘ in me.’

‘ If I have a mind to bend my finger, stir my  
 ‘ hand, sit, stand, walk, run, spit, blow my nose,  
 ‘ ease myself, make water : what ! shall the help of  
 ‘ God be always necessary for me ?’

This St. Hierome calls blasphemy and sacrilege ;  
 and says,

‘ What venom of heretics does not this surpass ?  
 ‘ They maintain that by reason of the freedom of  
 ‘ their will they have no further need of God.’

He has nothing here of original sin, and so not  
 of infants. He promised a larger work, in which  
 he would refute all their errors ; which he performed  
 314. two years after.

The next year St. Austin wrote a large and elab-  
 orate letter in answer to one he had received out of  
 Sicily from Hilarius. It is to be noted that Cæ-  
 lestius, after his being condemned in Africa, or else  
 in going from Rome to Africa, had made his abode  
 for some time in Sicily ; and had, as it seems, sowed  
 the seeds of his heresy there. For Hilarius desired

St. Austin's judgment concerning some new doctrine, 'which,' says he, 'some Christians at Syracuse  
'do publish<sup>g</sup>.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.)

1. 'That a man may be without sin, and keep  
'God's commandments easily, if he will.

2. 'That an unbaptized infant surprised with  
'death cannot perish deservedly, because he is born  
'without sin.

3. 'That a rich man, if he keep his wealth, and  
'do not sell all that he has, cannot enter into the  
'kingdom of God. And that it will not avail him  
'that he uses his riches well [or according to the  
'commandments].

4. 'That one must not swear at all.

5. 'Whether the church, of which it is written,  
'not having spot or wrinkle, be that in which we  
'now live, or that which we hope for. For some  
'think it is this church which consists of present  
'persons,' &c.

To the second of these St. Austin answers<sup>h</sup>,

'Whereas they say, "An unbaptized infant can-  
'not perish because he is born without sin." The  
'apostle does not say so: and I suppose it is better  
'to believe the apostle than them. For that teacher  
'of the Gentiles, in whom Christ speaks, says, *By*  
'*one man sin entered into the world, &c. For judg-*  
'*ment was by one (offence) to condemnation; but the*  
'*free gift is of many offences unto justification*<sup>i</sup>.  
'Therefore if they can find any infant that is not  
'sprung from the concupiscence of that one man; of

<sup>g</sup> Inter Epistolas Augustini, Ep. 88. [156, ed. Benedict. tom. ii. p. 542.]

<sup>h</sup> Epist. 89. [157. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>i</sup> Rom. v. 12, &c.

CHAP. 'such an one let them say, that he is not liable to that  
 XIX. 'condemnation, nor needs by the grace of Christ to  
 (A.D. 410.) 'be delivered from it.'

'What means, *By one offence to condemnation*,  
 'but, by that one offence in which Adam offended?  
 'And what means, *Of many offences to justification*;  
 'but that the grace of Christ does take off not only  
 'that offence with which infants, sprung from that one  
 'man, are held bound; but also the many offences  
 'which, when they are grown men, they add to it  
 'by wicked practices? But still that one, to which  
 'the carnal offspring that derives from that first  
 'man is liable, is, he says, enough for their con-  
 'demnation. Therefore the baptism of infants is  
 'no more than what is necessary: that they, who by  
 'their generation are subject to that condemnation,  
 'may by regeneration be freed from it. And as  
 'there is not a person in the world who is carnally  
 'generated but from Adam; so neither is any  
 'spiritually regenerated but by Christ. The carnal  
 'generation is liable to that one offence, and the  
 'condemnation thereof: but the spiritual regenera-  
 'tion takes away not only that one for which infants  
 'are baptized; but also those many which men by  
 'wicked living have added to that in which they are  
 'generated.

'And therefore he goes on, and says, *If by one*  
 '*man's offence death reigned by one; much more*  
 '*they which receive the abundance of grace &c. shall*  
 '*reign &c. Therefore as by the offence of one*  
 '*judgment came upon all men to condemnation;*  
 '*even so by the righteousness of one the free gift*  
 '*came upon all men unto justification of life. For*  
 '*as by one man's disobedience many were made*



‘ sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be  
‘ made righteous. [Cap. iii. §. 11.]

CHAP.  
XIX.

‘ What will they say to this? Or what is possible  
‘ for them to say, unless they will plead that the  
‘ apostle is mistaken? that chosen vessel, the teacher  
‘ of the Gentiles, that trumpet of Christ, proclaims,  
‘ *Judgment came by one to condemnation*: and these  
‘ proclaim on the contrary; and say, that infants,  
‘ who, as they confess, derive from that one man  
‘ of whom he speaks, do not go into condemnation,  
‘ though they be not baptized.’

(A.D. 410.)

‘ *Judgment*, says he, *came by one to condemnation*.  
‘ By one, what does he mean, but by one offence?  
‘ Since it follows, *But the grace is of many offences*  
‘ *to justification*.’

Then he answers to that plea of theirs, by which they said that St. Paul by *one offence* meant both the sin of Adam, and also all the sins which men by imitating that do commit.

He shews, that if St. Paul had meant so, he would have said in like manner of the grace of Christ, that that was of one offence to justification: but he distinguishes, and says, condemnation came by *one* offence; but the grace of Christ justifies from *many* offences. [§. 20.]

Afterwards he says, ‘ If as they pretend, the apostle had said these things on this account, that we should understand sinners to belong to that first man, not that we derive sin by being born of him, but by imitating him: he would rather have named the Devil; for he sinned first, and from him mankind do not derive their pedigree, but only they imitate him.—And if it were on account of imitation that the apostle named the first man,

CHAP. XIX.  
 (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> ‘ because he was the first sinner among men, and  
 ‘ for that reason all sinful men were said to belong  
 ‘ to him : why did he not name Abel as the second  
 ‘ man, who was the first righteous among men ?  
 ‘ ——— But he names Adam, and on the other part  
 ‘ names none but Christ. Because as the one, a  
 ‘ man, did by his sin defile his posterity ; so the  
 ‘ other, God and man, did by his righteousness save  
 ‘ his inheritance : the one by transferring [or con-  
 ‘ veying] the defilement of the flesh, which the  
 ‘ Devil though wicked, could not ; the other by  
 ‘ giving the grace of his Spirit, which Abel, though  
 ‘ righteous, could not.’ [§. 21.]

He at last observes to Hilarius, that Cælestius had been condemned for this doctrine at Carthage two years before : and tells him that he himself had published some books, and had preached oftentimes against it, and had recovered several. That there were still some at Carthage that held that opinion ; but privately : that in many places there were more of them than one would expect. ‘ And where they  
 ‘ are not refuted, they seduce others to their sect ;  
 ‘ and are grown so numerous, that I know not what  
 ‘ it will come to. But we wish rather that they  
 ‘ should be healed in the unity of the church, than  
 ‘ that they should be cut off from the body of it  
 ‘ as incurable members ; provided necessity do not  
 ‘ compel it. For there is some fear lest more limbs  
 ‘ do putrify, whilst the putrified ones are spared,’ &c.  
 [§. 22.]

XXI. The third and fourth positions of the Pelagians, about a rich man, and about swearing, are such as may possibly raise the reader’s curiosity to know what was said to those questions in these times.

To the third St. Austin observes, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were rich, and continued so; and yet have a place in the kingdom. That the rich man in the parable did not go into torment because he died rich; but because he was luxurious, and unmerciful to Lazarus: that Lazarus, when he died, was carried into the bosom of a rich man, &c. [§. 23.]

And whereas the Pelagians pretended that the selling of all is necessary under the New Testament, though not under the Old; he observes that our Saviour, who set the rich young man this condition of being perfect; *sell that thou hast*, &c., yet did not set this as the condition of entering into life: but that other, *keep the commandments*<sup>k</sup>. That the apostle, teaching rich men how to *lay hold on eternal life*<sup>l</sup>, bids them *do good, distribute, communicate*, &c., but does not require them to sell all. [§. 24—26.]

But to the argument which they raised from these words of our Saviour, *A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven*<sup>m</sup>, &c., St. Austin makes no answer but what seems defective. ‘How is ‘it then,’ says he, ‘does the apostle speak contrary to ‘the Lord? Or do these men not understand what ‘they talk of?’ He refers them to Christ’s following words, *With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible*. Those they explained thus, as he tells us; ‘Christ knew that several rich men, ‘upon hearing the gospel, would sell their estates ‘and give them to the poor, &c., and so that would ‘be done which seemed so difficult: not that any of

<sup>k</sup> Matt. xix. 17, 21.

<sup>l</sup> 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18, 19.

<sup>m</sup> Matt. xix. 23, &c.



CHAP. XIX. ‘ them continuing in their wealth, would, by keeping  
 those rules of the apostle, lay hold on eternal life :  
 (A.D. 410.) ‘ but that selling all that they had, they would  
 ‘ so fulfil those rules of the apostle.’ [§. 28.]

Here St. Austin observes, that according to this their own interpretation, ‘ our Lord does, contrary ‘ to their tenet, set forth his own grace ; for he does ‘ not say, “ that which seems to you impossible, is ‘ easy for men to do, if they will.” But he says, ‘ *that which is impossible with men, is easy with ‘ God.*’ And following on that point, he forgets to return and give any answer how he himself would have those words of our Saviour to be understood. Only he observes that the apostle’s words could not be so meant as they explained them, viz. of selling all they had : because he gives several rules how they should provide for their servants, children, &c., which is not consistent with selling all they had : ‘ For,’ as he observes, ‘ how can this be done without a house, and something to keep it?’ [§. 29. *et seqq.*]

Our Saviour seems in that saying, *a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of God*, to have meant, as he does in many other places, by *the kingdom of heaven*, and *the kingdom of God*, not the kingdom of glory, but the state of the profession of the gospel, and of faith in him, as it was at that time, when both himself and all that would be his disciples, were so persecuted, that they could not think of keeping any estate if they had it. And as things so stood, it was very hard to persuade any rich man to enter into it ; so hard, that humanly speaking, it was impossible. Only God by the power of his grace might overcome that love of their

wealth, which hindered them from owning Christ. CHAP. XIX.  
Now that difficulty is not at all times; but only in ———  
times of persecution. 310.  
(A.D. 410.)

If this be the sense; the translation would be more intelligible if it were said, not ‘shall hardly,’ but ‘will hardly enter,’ &c.

And if this be the sense; then what St. Austin answers is pertinent and full: viz. that there are many rich men, who, though they do not actually sell all, and give to the poor, yet are ready to part with all, if occasion should be, for the sake of Christ and his truth; and who in the meantime do keep their families in Christian discipline, use hospitality and beneficence to the poor, receive a righteous man in the name of a righteous man, &c. And he takes notice that Pelagius himself was relieved in his necessities by such rich men, and entertained by them; (and others speak of him as a great haunter of such men’s houses:) he says,

‘These men, if they expect to be such as the apostle speaks of, *that shall judge angels*<sup>y</sup>, ought to resolve beforehand *to receive into everlasting habitations those that have made them their friends with the mammon of unrighteousness*<sup>z</sup>.———  
‘Those servants of God, who having sold all, do afterwards live upon the honest labour of their own hands, may with much less impudence condemn men from whom they receive nothing; than those that not being able by reason of some infirmity to work with their hands, do condemn the men that maintain them.’ [§. 37, 38.]

‘I that write this, was greatly in love with that perfection of which our Lord spoke, when he said

<sup>y</sup> 1 Cor. vi. 3.

<sup>z</sup> Luke xvi. 9.

CHAP. ' to the rich man, *Go and sell all, &c.*, and I did so ;  
 XIX. ' not by my own strength, but by his assisting grace.  
 (A.D. 410.) <sup>310.</sup> ' And though I was not rich ; there will never the  
 ' less be imputed to me for that : for the apostles  
 ' themselves, that did this first, were no rich men.  
 ' But he parts with all the world, that parts with  
 ' all that he has, or hopes to have.——And I do  
 ' my utmost endeavour to persuade others to this  
 ' purpose ; and I have in the name of God several  
 ' partners, who have by my ministry been brought  
 ' to it. But still so, as that the sound doctrine is  
 ' preserved among us ; and that we do not in way  
 ' of vainglory censure those that do not take the  
 ' same course ; and tell them that it will not avail  
 ' them to live chastely in matrimony, to order their  
 ' houses and families Christian like,' &c. [§. 39.]

I think this to be a modest and handsome rebuke of the pride of those two monks ; who valued themselves so much upon their selling their temporal possessions, that they censured all that did not do the like, as incapable of God's kingdom. St. Austin shews that he and several others had done the same, with less noise and less spiritual pride and censure.

To the fourth about swearing, he says thus :  
 ' Avoid swearing as much as is possible : for it is  
 ' better not to swear even to the truth, than by a  
 ' custom of swearing to fall often into perjury, and  
 ' always to come in danger of it. But these men, as  
 ' far as appears by what I have heard some of them  
 ' talk, do not know what is swearing ; for they  
 ' think they do not swear when they say, " God  
 ' knows," or, " God is witness," or, " I call God to wit-  
 ' ness upon my soul ;" because it is not said " By God :"



‘ and because such phrases as the forementioned are  
 ‘ found in the apostle Paul. But even that phrase  
 ‘ which they confess to be swearing is found in him, <sup>310.</sup>  
 ‘ when he says, *by your rejoicing which I have in* (A.D. 410.)  
 ‘ *Christ Jesus our Lord*<sup>a</sup>. For in the Greek this  
 ‘ plainly appears to be swearing : so that one cannot  
 ‘ take those words in the Latin, *per vestram glo-*  
 ‘ *riam*, “ by your rejoicing,” as those, *per meum ad-*  
 ‘ *ventum iterum ad vos*<sup>b</sup>, “ by my coming to you  
 ‘ again,” and many such like, where it is said, “ by  
 ‘ any thing,” and yet there is no swearing, are to be  
 ‘ taken.’

‘ But because the apostle, a man most strong in  
 ‘ the truth, swore in his epistles, we must not there-  
 ‘ fore make a sport of swearing. As for us, it is  
 ‘ much safer, as I said, never to swear ; but to make  
 ‘ use of Yes, yes ; and No, no ; as our Lord advises :  
 ‘ not that it is a sin to swear truly ; but it is a  
 ‘ most dreadful sin to swear falsely : into which he  
 ‘ naturally falls that accustoms himself to swear.’  
 [§. 40.]

This is St. Austin’s sense : and whereas some of  
 the ancients Fathers are against all swearing ; there  
 was a particular reason in their time : because all  
 the oaths then administered in courts were by the  
 heathen gods, or the genii of the emperors.

The instance that he gives of St. Paul’s swearing  
 is the plainest in the scripture : for whereas the  
 Latin language uses the word *per*, as the English  
 the word *by*, to many other purposes, as well as  
 swearing ; the Greek, as St. Austin observes, has a  
 peculiar word *νῆ* for *by*, in the case of swearing by  
 any thing, and which is never used but in swearing :

<sup>a</sup> 1 Cor. v. 31.<sup>b</sup> Phil. i. 26.

CHAP. as *νὴ Διὰ*, and *νὴ τοὺς Θεούς*. And so *νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν*  
 XIX. *καύχησιν*, is, without any more addition, ‘I swear [for  
 (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> ‘which our English have put I protest] by your  
 ‘glory, [or rejoicing,] which I have in Christ Jesus  
 ‘our Lord,’ i. e. by that which is our common  
 Christian hope and joy.

XXII. There came the same year some more questions out of Sicily for St. Austin to resolve, from Eutropius and Paulus. They sent him a paper, entitled, *Definitiones, ut dicitur, Cælestii*, ‘Arguments given out, as is said, by Cælestius.’

It contained fourteen arguments, or rather one argument diversified in words fourteen times; to prove that a man may be without sin if he will. That argument is no other than this dilemma, ‘God’s commands are either possible or impossible,’ &c.

It might be worth the while of a young sophister to read them for a pattern to see how many ways that fallacy may be varied; as, ‘sin is either a thing that may be avoided, or that cannot be avoided,’ &c., ‘sin is either a thing of will, or of necessity,’ &c. but they are not worth reciting here. St. Austin recites them, and gives particular answers to each of them<sup>c</sup>: that a man may by God’s grace have in general a will, desire, and aim to avoid all sin: but by reason of our frailty, no man finds that purpose to hold out so steady in all particulars but that he often slips, and sometimes falls. Neither does it do us any good to prove how unblameable we should be on supposition that our will were faultless: since our greatest blemish is the corrupt inclination of our

<sup>c</sup> Lib. de Perfectione Justitiæ Homini, ad Eutropium. [Op. tom. x. p. 167, &c.]

will itself, which complies with the tentations, in all men at some times and to some degree; but in men destitute of God's grace, so far as to yield the dominion to sin. And since this is too plain by experience; what do sophisms to the contrary avail us? Our business is to get cure by God's grace for this distemper, not to dispute ourselves out of the sense of it.

About this time Pelagius wrote one of his most elaborate pieces, entitled, 'Of the Abilities of Nature.' To which St. Austin, next year, wrote an answer, entitled, 'Of Nature and Grace<sup>d</sup>.' He owns<sup>e</sup> that Pelagius had shewn an example of a most strong and nimble wit, and had well reproved those that excuse their wickedness by laying all the fault of it on the nature of man: but that he had carried this zeal too far, in saying that men that are wicked might have been sinless if they would; and, 'that if they were sinners because they could not be otherwise, they are not to be blamed.' On which St. Austin makes this remark<sup>f</sup>, 'mind what he says: 'now I say that an infant born and surprised with death in such a place where he cannot be relieved by the baptism of Christ, is as he is, (viz. dies without the washing of regeneration,) because he could be no otherwise. Let him then absolve such an one, and set open the kingdom of heaven to him, in spite of our Lord's declaration,' &c.

Among several arguments as good as the case would bear, Pelagius there uses one very silly logical quirk. In opposition to what the church held of our nature in the state in which it now is, viz. that it is depraved and weakened by sin, he said<sup>g</sup>,

<sup>d</sup> [Op. tom. x. p. 127, &c.]

<sup>e</sup> Cap. 6.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 7.

<sup>g</sup> Apud Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 19.



CHAP. XIX.  
 (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> ‘What is sin? Is it any substantial thing; or a  
 ‘name without any substance, by which is meant  
 ‘not any real thing, not any existence, not any bo-  
 ‘dily thing; but the act of something done amiss?  
 ‘And how can that which has no substance weaken  
 ‘or change human nature?’

St. Austin produces the instance of some godly man, crying out, as it is, Ps. xli. 4, *Lord, be merciful to me, heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee, &c.* He bids Pelagius ask such a man, ‘What he ails? What is sin, is it a substance,’ &c.? ‘How can a thing that has no substance defile thy soul,’ &c.? And then adds, ‘would not the man, in the bitterness of his soul, bid him begone,’ &c.? ‘You see whither this argument tends, and to what it would lead us; to think those words spoken to no purpose; *Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.* For how shall he save them if they have no ailing? Sins, from which the gospel says Christ’s people are to be saved, are no substances, and so cannot defile. Oh, brother, it were a good thing if you would remember that you are a Christian<sup>h</sup>!’

XXIII. Pelagius proved that men may be without sin, by instancing<sup>i</sup> in a great many persons who had been so, as he pretended: Abel, Enoch, Melchizedek, and twenty more: and in some women; Deborah, Anna, Judith, &c., and also the mother of our Lord and Saviour; concerning whom he said, ‘That it is necessary for our religion that we do confess her to be without sin.’

St. Austin answers, ‘Excepting the holy Virgin Mary, concerning whom I am not willing, for the honour of our Lord, to hold any dispute at all

<sup>h</sup> [Cap. 20.]

<sup>i</sup> Apud Augustin. de Natura et Gratia, cap. 36.

‘ when we are talking about sin, (Unde enim scimus  
 ‘ quid ei plus gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum C H A P.  
XIX.  
 ‘ omni ex parte peccatum, quæ concipere ac parere 310.  
(A.D.410.)  
 ‘ meruit [eum], quem constat nullum habuisse pec-  
 ‘ catum? Hac ergo virgine excepta &c.) For how  
 ‘ do we know what more grace was bestowed on her  
 ‘ to overcome all sin, who had the honour to con-  
 ‘ ceive and bring forth him who certainly had no  
 ‘ sin? But (this Virgin excepted) if we could have  
 ‘ called together all those holy men and women  
 ‘ when they were alive, and have asked them whe-  
 ‘ ther they were without sin; what do you think  
 ‘ they would have said? As this man says, or as  
 ‘ the apostle John says?——They would all have  
 ‘ cried out with one voice, *If we say that we have*  
 ‘ *no sin, we deceive ourselves,*’ &c.

From what the papists nowadays say and practise in reference to the blessed Virgin, one would think that all antiquity had believed her to be sinless: but by examining we shall find that Pelagius here is the first that ever said that she was without sin. St. Austin indeed makes a very modest answer; as thinking it decent for us, in regard to the honour of our Saviour, not to hold any talk about the sins of his mother: but as one may guess by this place, and more plainly by some other, he was far from affirming her to be sinless. He often speaks positively of all mankind as sinful, excepting only our Saviour Christ. And for other Fathers, they make no scruple, when it comes in their way, to speak particularly of her failings: as Chrysostom on John ii. 3. And St. Hierome having repeated her Canticum, bids Pelagius mark, that ‘ she does not call  
 ‘ herself blessed for any merit or virtue of her own;

CHAP. 'but by the mercy of God, who vouchsafed to in-  
XIX. 'habit in her<sup>i</sup>.'

(A.D.<sup>310</sup>.410.) Aquinas having produced, by way of objection against himself, several reasons and some authorities, that she had sin<sup>k</sup>, answers them all with that text, Cant. iv. 7, *Thou art all fair, my love, there is no spot in thee*; and with this passage of St. Austin. Now this is not to his purpose as it stands here: but in Aquinas' citation the words are altered. He reads them thus, 'Inde enim scimus quod ei plus 'gratiæ collatum fuerit ad vincendum ex omni parte 'peccatum, quod concipere,' &c. 'For we know that 'more grace was bestowed on her to overcome all 'sin, by this; that she had the honour to conceive ' [or, deserved to conceive,'] &c. But the Jesuit Vasquez had something more of honesty: for though he would have the words read as Aquinas reads them; yet he confesses that he found them in the book as I have transcribed them. He quotes 'Unde 'enim,' but adds as of his own, 'or rather *inde* 'enim:.' and he quotes 'quid ei plus gratiæ;' but says, as of his own head, 'or rather, *quod ei plus* 'gratiæ<sup>l</sup>.' And the word *quæ* he does not pretend to alter into *quod* at all.

The edition that Vasquez had, was more unexceptionable, and gives even less occasion to the popish alterations, than that out of which I transcribe, which is Erasmus', printed at Venice, 1551. (and his editions are commonly the least tainted

<sup>i</sup> Dialog. 1. [contra Pelagianos, §. 16. Op. ii. p. 698.]

<sup>k</sup> Thomæ Aquinatis Summa Theologica; pars tertia, quæstio 27. art. 3, 4.

<sup>l</sup> Comment. in tertiam partem Summæ Thomæ: tom. ii. Disp. 117. cap. 3.



with their corruptions of the text); for Vasquez reads *quid*, which, together with the sense of the discourse there, justifies my alteration. If there were not some eye kept over these men, they would, both in the Fathers, and in the scripture too, alter the words as some of them have done here, to serve their turn.

CHAP.  
XIX.  

---

310.  
(A.D. 410.)

They had better take Pelagius' words, which serve their purpose without any alteration: it would not be the first time they have borrowed from some heretic a doctrine which was never owned in the ancient catholic church. Pelagius does not only say she was sinless, but makes it a necessary point of religion to believe so; which fits them to a hair.

XXIV. Pelagius lived all this while at Jerusalem: but what he wrote was in Latin; so that his opinions were more talked of in the west, where he had lived, and where that language was understood and spoken, than in the east, where he now was; because little but Greek was read or spoken there.

He could not have found a more convenient retreat than at Jerusalem: for John the bishop there, with whom he lived, was himself addicted to new opinions. Both Epiphanius and St. Hierome had a good while before wrote against him for holding several of the condemned opinions of Origen; to which some of Pelagius' tenets were pretty near akin.

About this time there happened a meeting of bishops at Jerusalem: and Orosius, a young man, who had been with St. Austin, and was now at Bethlehem with St. Hierome, came to this meeting; and declared to them what a noise there was in the west, about some doctrines published by Celestius, and countenanced by some writings of

CHAP. Pelagius, and that St. Austin had wrote against them.  
XIX.

And he caused to be read<sup>m</sup> to them (as well as  
(A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup> could be done by an interpreter) St. Austin's letter  
<sup>315.</sup> to Hilarius, mentioned before in §. 20, 21<sup>n</sup>. Pelagius being asked whether he had taught those doctrines, against which St. Austin there writes; answered, 'Who is that Austin?' [or, what is Austin to me<sup>o</sup>?] Some in the council answered, 'He that speaks against that bishop by whose means God has restored unity to all Africa, deserves to be turned out not only from this assembly, but from the whole church.'

They referred to the service St. Austin had done in reducing the Donatists.

But bishop John, who presided, interposed for him: and all that was urged against him at that time being this, that he had maintained that a man might live without sin; John said, 'If he had maintained this to be possible without God's help, it were a thing to be condemned; but since he adds that, what have you to say? Do you deny God's help?' So a squabble arising, and Orosius, who could speak no Greek, as they no Latin, not being able to make them understand the fallacy which Pelagius concealed under that word, 'God's help;' the issue was, that the matter should be referred to Innocent, bishop of Rome, and that in the mean time Pelagius should keep silence: and so nothing at this meeting was said about original

<sup>m</sup> Pauli Orosii Apologetic. [contra Pelagium, de Arbitrii libertate; sub init. p. 590. edit. Haverkamp, Lugd. Bat. 1738.]

[<sup>n</sup> See above, p. 392.]

<sup>o</sup> [The words, as quoted by Orosius, are, 'et quis est mihi Augustinus?']

sin. And John the bishop took occasion quickly after to fall out with Orosius: upon which he wrote his Apologetic, which is still extant, and out of which some quotations to our purpose about infant-baptism might be taken; but they have nothing different from what St. Austin, and St. Hierome, and Pelagius himself, have: and therefore I shall for brevity omit them.

But about the latter end of this year 415, there was another assembly of fourteen bishops in this country, at the town which in scripture is called Lydda, but was then called Diospolis, to which Pelagius was summoned. And there he could come off no other way but by denying several of his opinions, which he had promoted before; and which (as St. Austin makes appear) he for all this denial continued to promote afterward.

The articles objected to him were taken, partly out of some books of his own; partly out of some books of Cælestius, who was looked on as his scholar; and partly out of the acts of a council at Carthage, where Cælestius had been condemned; and partly out of that catalogue of new opinions which Hilarius had sent to St. Austin out of Sicily, and which St. Austin refuted in the forementioned letter.

Of what was cited from his own books, he denied part; and said the book was not writ by him, though it went under his name. The rest he defended, and put as fair a colour on as he could; which was easy to do, because what he had wrote in Latin, (which these bishops did not understand,) he explained to them in Greek<sup>p</sup>: (for he did not speak to them by

<sup>p</sup> Aug. de Gestis Pelagii Palæst. cap. i. §. 2.



C H A P. an interpreter, as Mr. Le Clerc mistakes the matter :)  
 XIX.  
 ——— and because his accusers were not there, being sick ;  
 (A.D.<sup>310.</sup>410.) but only their libel was read.

But he himself had been wary in his expressions, for what Cælestius had. Of the articles taken from the books or words of Cælestius he defended some ; as, ‘ The possibility of avoiding all sin, by God’s ‘ help,’ &c., but renounced the rest, in these words ; ‘ The other things, as they confess themselves, were ‘ not spoken by me ; and so I have no reason to ‘ answer for them. Yet, for the satisfaction of the ‘ holy synod, I do renounce [anathematize] all that ‘ do hold so<sup>q</sup>.’ So he got off with a whole skin ; but left several of his beloved opinions behind him condemned, as appears by minding which those were that he renounced.

The account of the whole is long : especially of those articles which bore a dispute in what sense he had spoke or understood them. What is most material to give us the sense of the church at that time, is, to recite those which the council condemned, and he was forced to condemn : which you have in the words of St. Austin, in his letter to Paulinus<sup>r</sup>, expressed much shorter than in the book *De Gestis Palæst.*, (where the acts of this council are at large recited,) but to the same effect. He writes thus :

‘ For beside those articles which he ventured to ‘ defend as well as he could ; some things were ‘ objected to him, which unless he had renounced ‘ [anathematized] he would have been renounced ‘ himself.

‘ For it was objected, that he said [or held,]

<sup>q</sup> August. eodem libro, [cap. ii. §. 24.]

<sup>r</sup> Epist. 106. [186. cap. 9. §. 32, 33. ed. Benedict.]

1. ‘ That Adam, whether he had sinned or not, CHAP.  
XIX.  
‘ would have died.

2. ‘ That his sin hurt himself only, and not man- 310.  
(A.D. 410.)  
‘ kind.

3. ‘ That infants new born are in the same state  
‘ that Adam was before his fall.

4. ‘ That neither by the death or fall of Adam  
‘ does all mankind die, nor by the resurrection of  
‘ Christ does all mankind arise.’

These you see, are the same that had been objected to Cælestius<sup>s</sup> four years before.

5 ‘ That infants, though they be not baptized,  
‘ have eternal life.

6. ‘ That rich men, unless they part with all, &c.,  
‘ cannot have the kingdom of God.’

These two were taken out of the heads of new doctrine broached at Syracuse<sup>†</sup>.

7. ‘ That the grace of God is not given in every  
‘ action; but is in freewill; or, in the law and  
‘ doctrine.’

And several other articles about grace and merit.

‘ All these Pelagius did so renounce [anathematizavit] as the acts of the council do shew,  
‘ that he did not produce any thing in defence of  
‘ them. From whence it follows, that whosoever  
‘ will own the authority of that episcopal judgment,  
‘ and the confession of Pelagius himself, must hold  
‘ these things, (which the catholic church has ever  
‘ held,) viz.

‘ That Adam, if he had not sinned, would not  
‘ have died.

‘ That his sin hurt, not himself only, but man-  
‘ kind.

<sup>s</sup> See above, §. 5.

<sup>†</sup> See above, §. 20.

CHAP. ' That infants new born are not in the state that  
 XIX. ' Adam was before his fall, &c.

(A.D.<sup>310.</sup>410.) ' That unbaptized infants will miss, not only of  
 ' the kingdom of heaven, but also of eternal life,'  
 &c.

Though this must needs have cost Pelagius a sore pang; yet so it happened, that the news of his being acquitted in this council made more noise among the vulgar people to his advantage, than his being compelled to renounce those opinions did against his cause: especially in the west, where they heard he was acquitted and approved; but did not hear upon what terms. He himself also published accounts of the matter to his own advantage<sup>n</sup>, and triumphed of his success. So that the Pelagians were never more uppish, than they were for a while after this synod.

And yet, upon the whole matter, though St. Austin does often speak of these bishops, as having been imposed on by Pelagius in matter of fact; and do shew how he disguised and concealed his true meaning from them; and though he do, in a letter, which he a little while after this wrote to John bishop of Jerusalem, desiring him to send a copy of the acts of the council, say thus, ' As for Pelagius, our  
 ' brother and your son, whom I hear you love very  
 ' well; I advise you so to manage your love to him,  
 ' that they that know him, and have attentively  
 ' heard him, may not judge your holiness to be  
 ' imposed on by him, &c. For when you hear him  
 ' confess the grace and help of God, you think he  
 ' means the same that you do, who have a catholic  
 ' sense of it, because you do not know what he has

<sup>n</sup> Aug. de Gestis Pelagii Palæstin. cap. 30.



‘ wrote in his book; and for that reason I have  
 ‘ sent you his book, and mine written in answer to CHAP.  
XIX.  
 ‘ it<sup>x</sup>.’ And though St. Hierome do on this account 310.  
(A.D. 410.)  
 call this synod, ‘ the pitiful synod of Diospolis<sup>y</sup>;’  
 yet, I say, upon the whole matter, it appears by the  
 acts of this council, that these bishops, though as  
 St. Austin says, ‘ they could not thoroughly ex-  
 ‘ amine the man; yet for the heresy itself, they  
 ‘ gave it a deadly wound<sup>z</sup>.’ For by forcing Pela-  
 gius to declare what he did, about the sin of Adam,  
 the natural state of infants, and the necessity of  
 God’s grace, and the renouncing of merit, they  
 shewed that they were far enough from Pelagian-  
 ism: so that St. Austin says, that when he read the  
 acts of this council, and before he saw Pelagius’  
 books of freewill, wherein he returned to his vomit  
 again; he thought ‘ that this question had been at an  
 ‘ end; and that Pelagius had plainly owned original  
 ‘ sin in infants<sup>a</sup>.’

XXV. This I note the rather, because some among  
 us nowadays, that shew a good-will to Pelagianism,  
 and do strangely shuffle with that ninth Article of  
 the church of England, which is of original sin, ex-  
 pounding it all away, do shelter themselves under  
 the pretended authority of the Greek church, as if  
 the Greek Fathers had not owned that doctrine.  
 Whereas not only this council that acquitted Pela-  
 gius, yet condemned the opinions laid to his charge;  
 but also the other councils of the eastern nations  
 agreed with the Latins in condemning the said

<sup>x</sup> Epist. 252. [179. §. 1—5. ed. Benedict.]

<sup>y</sup> Hieronym. Epist. 79. [143. ed. Vallars.]

<sup>z</sup> De Gestis Pal. cap. 21.

<sup>a</sup> Lib. ii. de Peccato Origin. cap. 14.

CHAP. doctrines; and the men too when it appeared that  
 XIX. they really held such doctrines.

(A.D. <sup>310.</sup><sub>410.</sub>) For three years after this, Theodotus bishop of  
 318. Antioch held a synod at Jerusalem, to which Pelagius was cited, and there condemned; as is recorded by Marius Mercator, *Commonitor.* cap. 3.

And sometime after, Julian the Pelagian, with seventeen more of his party, wrote to the bishop of Thessalonica, representing their own doctrine in the fairest colours, and that of the catholics in the west in the blackest; hoping to make a party in the Greek church<sup>b</sup>: but found none, or hardly any, that they could bring over.

Cælestius, before his condemnation at Rome, went to Constantinople, to try if any interest could be made there. But Atticus, the bishop there, would neither receive him nor his doctrine<sup>c</sup>. St. Austin mentions this in short, lib. iii. *Contra Julian.* cap. 1. But Mercator more at large, *Commonitor.* cap. 1. ‘Some years after he went to Constantinople, in  
 ‘the time of Atticus of holy memory; where being  
 ‘discovered to hold such opinions, he was by the  
 ‘great care of that holy man driven from that  
 ‘city: and letters were sent concerning him into  
 ‘Asia, to Thessalonica and Carthage, to the bishops there; of which I have copies ready to be  
 ‘produced. But the said Cælestius being driven  
 ‘from hence also went to Rome,’ &c.

At Ephesus also they were rejected and disowned, ‘not suffered to abide there;’ which is the word of

<sup>b</sup> August. ad Bonifac. contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum, cap. 1. §. 3.

<sup>c</sup> Acta concilii Ephesini, part. i. cap. 18. [Labbe. iii. p. 353. Mansi, iv. p. 1025.]

Prosper, who relates this, *lib. de Ingratis*, cap. 2. CHAP.  
XIX.  
But Mr. Le Clerc expresses it, ‘ill treated.’

The only hopeful attempt they ever made in the (A.D. 410.<sup>310.</sup>)  
Greek church was about fifteen years after this time: <sup>331.</sup>

when a general council being called to Ephesus on account of Nestorius, (who had innovated in the doctrine of the incarnation,) they joined their party with his, as is usual for discontented parties to do; and made in all at first forty-three, but quickly dwindled to thirty, as appears by the address of the council to the emperor; where they say, ‘It is an ‘absurd thing that thirty men only (some of whom ‘had been a good while ago deposed, some are of ‘the false opinion of Cælestius, &c.) should set ‘themselves against a synod of 210 bishops, with ‘whom all the western bishops (and so the whole ‘world) do consent.’ They made also canons<sup>d</sup>, ‘that ‘if any clergyman did publicly or privately promote ‘the opinions of Nestorius or Cælestius, they should ‘be deprived.’

These things, and more to the same purpose, are largely and particularly quoted out of the acts of that council, by bishop Ussher, in the forementioned treatise<sup>e</sup>. So that it is hard to guess what these men get by appealing to the Greek church.

And for the Greek Fathers before this time; Vossius has largely shewn in his Pelagian history<sup>f</sup>, that they commonly teach the doctrine of original sin. Only he thinks Clemens Alexandrinus must be

<sup>d</sup> Can. 4. [apud Labb. iii. p. 805. Mansi, iv. 1473.]

<sup>e</sup> See above, cap. 11.

<sup>f</sup> [‘Historiæ de controversiis quas Pelagius ejusque reliquiæ ‘moverunt libri vii.’ published separately more than once, and in the sixth volume of his collected works, fol. Amst. 1701.]



CHAP. excepted: but Dr. Hammond shews<sup>g</sup> that there is  
 XIX. no reason for that exception. Vossius is of opinion  
 (A.D. 410.<sup>310.</sup>) that there is no difference between St. Austin and  
 the ancient Greek Fathers about that other point,  
 of prædestination; but that<sup>h</sup> what the ancients Fa-  
 thers omitted concerning prædestination, he adds.  
 But, allowing that to be a matter in which men  
 will always pass various judgments, and will find  
 each their own sentiments both in the scripture and  
 the Fathers; it cannot with any modesty at all be  
 pretended that they do not own and complain of  
 original sin, or natural corruption. It is true, that  
 most of them were of opinion that this corruption or  
 sin should in unbaptized infants be punished no  
 otherwise than by the loss of the kingdom of heaven.  
 And in this indeed they differed from most of the  
 Latins.

Mr. Le Clerc says<sup>i</sup>, ‘ they that have so ill an opin-  
 ‘ ion of Pelagius, as St. Austin had, do say, that if  
 ‘ St. Austin had been able to read the Greek doctors,  
 ‘ he would have found that they speak no otherwise  
 ‘ than Pelagius does; as may,’ says he, ‘ be seen in a  
 ‘ great many places in St. Chrysostom, and in Isi-  
 ‘ dore of Pelusium, whom some moderns have openly  
 ‘ accused of Pelagianism.’

By singling out St. Chrysostom, he follows the  
 steps of the old Pelagians; for it appears out of  
 St. Austin’s books against Julian the Pelagian, lib. i.  
 and lib. iii. that he and Anianus do make their  
 chief boast of St. Chrysostom, and do fetch more  
 for their purpose out of him than out of any other  
 Greek writer. They translated some of his orations

<sup>g</sup> Annot. on Psalm 51.    <sup>h</sup> De Historicis Latinis, lib. ii. cap. 1.

<sup>i</sup> Bibl. Univers. tom. viii. p. 192.

that were most for their turn: and St. Austin, CHAP. XIX. though not very conversant indeed in the Greek language, yet shewed that he could read and tolerably understand it, by giving instances wherein they had made them more for their purpose than they were, by their translation, as I recited before in chap. xiv. And besides, he answered them by producing other places of his, where he plainly owns original sin. (A.D. 410. 310.)

And for other Greek doctors, who were more to be regarded (for St. Chrysostom was no ancients than St. Austin himself,) he shews the doctrine of Irenæus, St. Basil, St. Gregory, &c., to have been clear and full in this matter: and says<sup>k</sup>, though he had a translation of the sermon of St. Basil, which he quoted, yet ‘ he chose rather to translate it himself word for word out of the Greek, that it might be more exact.’ The like he does in the same book with two passages of St. Chrysostom, setting down the Greek words. So that the foresaid censure, passed on him, has more in it of the assuming humour of a critic, than it has of truth or good manners.

And to expect of St. Austin that he should have read Isidore, to know the sense of the Greek church, is (if one consider the age of each) a jest indeed.

I gave some instances above, in chap. xiv. where both St. Chrysostom, and this Isidore, and also Theodoret, (for they all run in one vein, and the two latter shew a great ambition to imitate the former,) have expressions something like those of

<sup>k</sup> Lib. i. Contra Julian. [cap. 5. §. 18.]

<sup>l</sup> Sermo i. de Jejunio [apud Basilii Opera, tom. ii. p. 1, &c. edit. Benedict.]

CHAP. Pelagius about infant-baptism, viz. ‘that infants are  
 XIX. ‘baptized though they have no sins:’ where yet it  
 (A.D. 310. 410.) appears by circumstances that their meaning was  
 315. only that they had no actual ones.

XXVI. About the same time that the synod of Diospolis was held, St. Hierome published his three books against the opinions of Pelagius<sup>m</sup>, (not naming him, but sufficiently decyphering him,) in form of dialogues between a Pelagian and a Catholic, under the feigned names of Atticus and Critobulus; Atticus representing the Catholic, and Critobulus the Pelagian. The far greatest part of them, (which I must omit,) is taken up in setting forth the pride and presumption of that tenet of Pelagius, that a man may in this life be without sin; which had been so smartly done by Atticus, that toward the end of the third dialogue, Critobulus, reckoning that he could maintain this to be true in the case of infants at least, if not of grown persons, says thus; [§. 17.]

*Crit.* ‘I can hold no longer; all my patience is  
 ‘overcome by your provoking way of talk. I pray  
 ‘tell me wherein have infants sinned? Neither can  
 ‘the conscience of any fault, nor can their ignorance  
 ‘be imputed to them; who, according to that of the  
 ‘prophet Jonah, know not their right hand from  
 ‘their left. They are in no case to commit sin, and  
 ‘yet they are in a case to perish: their knees  
 ‘double under them; their tender age can utter no  
 ‘words; with a mouth that would speak if it could,  
 ‘they give a smile; and the torment of eternal  
 ‘misery is prepared for the poor babes.’

<sup>m</sup> [‘Dialogus contra Pelagianos, libris iii.’—This is printed in vol. ii. p. 683, &c. of Vallarsius’ edition.]



*Att.* ‘ Oh ! you are grown mighty eloquent,’ &c. CHAP.  
 ——— ‘ But do not run upon me with your flowers XIX.  
 ‘ of rhetoric (which are none of your own neither) (A.D. 310.  
 ‘ with which the ears of boys and shallow men 410.)  
 ‘ are wont to be caught; but tell me plainly what  
 ‘ you would say of them.’

*Crit.* ‘ This I say; grant me but this, that they  
 ‘ at least who cannot sin, are without sin.’

*Att.* ‘ I shall grant it, provided they be baptized  
 ‘ in Christ; and yet you shall not bring me to  
 ‘ yield to your proposition, “ that a person may be  
 ‘ without sin, if he will.” These have neither power  
 ‘ nor will, but they are free from all sin by the  
 ‘ grace of God, which they receive in baptism.’

*Crit.* ‘ You will force me to come to that invi-  
 ‘ dious question, and to say, what sin had they?  
 ‘ That you may make the people presently throw  
 ‘ stones at me; and that when you cannot murder  
 ‘ me by strength, you may by a device.’

*Att.* ‘ He murders a heretic that suffers him to  
 ‘ continue such,’ &c.

*Crit.* ‘ Tell me, I beseech you, and free me from  
 ‘ all doubt; for what reason are infants baptized?’

*Att.* ‘ That in baptism their sins may be for-  
 ‘ given.’

*Crit.* ‘ What sin have they incurred? Is any one  
 ‘ loosed that never was bound?’

*Att.* ‘ Do you ask me? That trumpet of the  
 ‘ gospel, that teacher of the gentiles, that golden  
 ‘ vessel shining through all the world, shall answer  
 ‘ you. *Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even*  
 ‘ *over them that had not sinned after the similitude*  
 ‘ *of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of*  
 ‘ *him that was to come,*’ &c. [he goes on to recite

CHAP. the fifth chapter to the Romans]. ‘ And if you ob-  
 XIX.  
 310.  
 (A.D. 410.) ‘ ject that it is said, that there were some that had  
 ‘ not sinned; understand it, that they sinned not  
 ‘ that sin which Adam committed in paradise, by  
 ‘ breaking God’s command. But all persons are  
 ‘ held obnoxious either by their own, or by their  
 ‘ forefather Adam’s sin. He that is an infant is in  
 ‘ baptism loosed from the bond of his forefather; he  
 ‘ that is of age to understand, is by the blood of  
 ‘ Christ freed, both from his own bond, and also  
 ‘ from that which is derived from another.’

‘ And that you may not think that I understand  
 ‘ this in an heretical [or heterodox] sense; the  
 ‘ blessed martyr Cyprian, (whom you pretend to  
 ‘ have imitated in collecting into order some places  
 ‘ of scripture,) in the epistle which he writes to  
 ‘ bishop Fidus, about the baptizing of infants, says  
 ‘ thus :

‘ “ If then the greatest offenders, and they that  
 ‘ have grievously sinned against God before, have,  
 ‘ when they afterwards come to believe, forgiveness  
 ‘ of their sins; and no person is kept off from bap-  
 ‘ tism and the grace: how much less reason is there  
 ‘ to refuse an infant, who being newly born has no  
 ‘ sin, save that being descended from Adam, ac-  
 ‘ cording to the flesh, he has from his very birth  
 ‘ contracted the contagion of the death anciently  
 ‘ threatened,” &c.’ [§. 18.]

He goes on to recite verbatim all the rest of the  
 epistle to the end; which I recited before in chap.  
 vi. §. 1. and then proceeds :

‘ That holy and accomplished person, bishop  
 ‘ Austin, wrote some time ago to Marcellinus (who  
 ‘ was afterward, though innocent, put to death by

‘ the heretics, on pretence that he had a hand in CHAP. XIX.  
 ‘ Heraclius’ usurpation) two books concerning the 

---

  
 ‘ baptism of infants, against your heresy, by which you (A.D. 410.)<sup>310.</sup>  
 ‘ would maintain that infants are baptized, not for  
 ‘ forgiveness of sins, but for the kingdom of heaven,  
 ‘ according to that which is written in the Gospel,  
 ‘ *Except a person be born again of water and the*  
 ‘ *Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.*  
 ‘ And a third book to the said Marcellinus, against  
 ‘ those that say (what you say) that a man may,  
 ‘ without the grace of God, be without sin if he will.  
 ‘ And a fourth to Hilarius, against your doctrine  
 ‘ that brings up so many odd things. And, they  
 ‘ say, he is setting out some more books particularly  
 ‘ relating to you ; which are not yet come to my  
 ‘ hands. So that I think it proper for me to spare  
 ‘ my pains on this subject ; lest that of Horace be  
 ‘ said to me, “ Never carry timber into the woods.”  
 ‘ For either I must superfluously say the same that  
 ‘ he has said : or else, if I would say any new  
 ‘ things, his excellent wit has forestalled all the  
 ‘ best.

‘ This one thing I will say, that this discourse  
 ‘ may at last have an end ; either you must set forth  
 ‘ a new creed, and after the Father, the Son, and the  
 ‘ Holy Ghost, baptize infants unto the kingdom of  
 ‘ heaven : or else, if you acknowledge one baptism  
 ‘ for infants, and for grown persons ; you must own  
 ‘ that infants are to be baptized for forgiveness  
 ‘ of sins ; sins after the similitude of Adam’s trans-  
 ‘ gression.

‘ And if the forgiveness of sins, which are the  
 ‘ sins of another, do seem to you unjust, or such as  
 ‘ he that could commit no sin himself has no need



CHAP. ' of ; then march over to your beloved<sup>n</sup>, who holds  
 XIX. ' that in baptism are forgiven those old sins which  
 (A.D.<sup>310.</sup>410.) ' have been committed in a former state in the  
 ' cœlestial regions : and so as you are influenced by  
 ' his authority in your other points, partake with  
 ' his error in this too.' [§. 19.]

Though St. Hierome, after having in these dialogues largely confuted the other errors of Pelagius, do insist but briefly on this proof of original sin from the baptism of infants, as being a matter which had been fully handled by St. Austin in the books he here mentions, and of which I gave some account before<sup>o</sup>, yet this little seems to have nettled and puzzled Pelagius more than all that was said by St. Austin. The Pelagians confessed that adult persons were baptized for 'forgiveness of sins;' but infants, having no sins, were baptized only for the 'kingdom of heaven.' This was to establish two sorts of baptism: which was contrary to that article of the Constantinopolitan creed, then received in all the world; 'I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins.' Pelagius could never get clear from this argument. And it appears by his answer, which we shall see presently, that he yielded more to the force of it than of any other.

XXVII. But in the mean time, and quickly after the synod of Diospolis, he published four books *Pro Libero Arbitrio*, 'In Defence of Freewill:' in which, beside what he has about the point of God's grace, he does, as St. Austin expresses it, 'not by any sly intimation, [as formerly,] but in a most open manner, maintain by all the force of argument he can, that human nature in infants is in no manner

<sup>n</sup> Origen.

<sup>o</sup> Sect. 6, 7, &c. ad 22.

‘polluted by derivation <sup>p</sup> [or birth].’ St. Austin gives there an instance of one of his sayings, in the first of the said four books <sup>q</sup>.

CHAP.  
XIX.  

---

310.  
(A.D. 410.)

‘All the good or evil for which we are to be  
‘praised or blamed, does not come into the world  
‘with us, but is acted by us. For we are born  
‘capable of either of these; not full [or possessed]  
‘of either of them. And as we are at first formed  
‘without any virtue; so likewise without any vice.  
‘And there is in a person, before the actings of his  
‘own will, nothing but what God has created [or,  
‘put into him].’

When people wondered how he could reconcile this with what he had said in the said synod; where he had, as was shewed before<sup>r</sup>, anathematized all that held any of these opinions: 1. ‘that Adam’s sin hurt himself only, and not mankind:’ 2. ‘that infants new-born are in the same state that Adam was before his fall:’ 3. ‘that infants, though not baptized, have eternal life:’ he invented these salvoes; which St. Austin mentions in a book written some time after<sup>s</sup>, and which shew that he had a faculty of juggling and equivocation enough for a Jesuit.

1. That it might be said truly enough, that Adam’s sin did hurt mankind as well as himself. But how? ‘Not by derivation, but by the ill example it gave.’ The Socinians may thank him for this explication: for it helps them to much such another about Christ’s death doing good to mankind.

2. That infants new-born are not in the same

<sup>p</sup> De Peccato originali, lib. ii. cap. 21.

<sup>q</sup> Cap. 13.

<sup>r</sup> Sect. 24.

<sup>s</sup> De Peccato origin. ii. cap. 15.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>310.</sup>  
(A.D. 410.)

state that Adam was before his fall, is true enough. But for a reason very different from what those bishops, whom he bantered, could imagine; viz. 'because he was a man, and they are but children.'

3. All the reason he could give for his condemning those that said, 'Unbaptized infants shall have 'eternal life,' was a saying which he often had in his mouth, 'As for infants that die without baptism, I know whither they do not go; but whither they do go, I know not, i. e. I know they do not go to the kingdom of heaven; but what becomes of them I know not<sup>t</sup>.'

It is plain enough from many places in St. Austin, that his followers held, that they should have a certain 'eternal life,' but not in the kingdom of heaven. But he himself, it seems, at least at this time, to salve what he had said in the synod, renounced those that determined so; and kept himself in reserve concerning their future state.

St. Austin's note on all this is, 'Does he think that when these propositions were set him to condemn in one sense; he does, by expounding them in another sense, make it out, that he did not deceive his judges? So far from that; that he deceived them so much the more slyly, as he now explains himself the more craftily<sup>u</sup>.'

<sup>316.</sup> XXVIII. The next year two councils were held in Africa, both about the same time: one at Carthage of sixty-eight bishops, the other at Milevis, for the province of Numidia, of sixty-one bishops. They had not then seen Pelagius' last four books, and had but an imperfect account of what had passed at Diospolis. But they found it necessary

<sup>t</sup> August. *ibid.* cap. 21.

<sup>u</sup> *Ibid.* cap. 16.



to condemn the Pelagian opinions; which had CHAP. XIX. taken some footing in those countries, but much more at Rome. And therefore they both of them (A.D. 410.<sup>310.</sup>) did, by synodical epistles written to Innocent bishop of Rome, desire the concurrence of that church; not that they thought their own decrees invalid without a confirmation from Rome, but because Rome was most infected. With which desire Innocent did very cordially comply in his answers; which answers, though written the year after, I shall recite here, leaving out both in the epistles and answers the greatest part, which is about grace; but inserting what they say about infants.

The Synodical Epistle of the Council of Carthage 316.  
to Innocent<sup>x</sup>.

They take notice of the report that Pelagius had been acquitted at the council of Diospolis, by denying most of the tenets objected to him; and then say,

‘If Pelagius do seem to your reverence also justly  
‘acquitted by those episcopal acts which are said to  
‘have passed in the east; yet the error itself, and  
‘the impiety which has so many abettors in several  
‘places, ought to be condemned by the authority of  
‘the apostolic see. Let your holiness then consider,  
‘and have a fellow-feeling with us in your pastoral  
‘bowels, how mischievous and destructive a thing  
‘that is to the sheep of Christ, which follows from  
‘their sacrilegious disputations; that we need not  
‘*pray that we enter not into temptation,*’ &c. [§. 4.]

They proceed to shew the necessity of praying for God’s assisting grace, from Luke xxii. 32. Eph. iii. 14, &c. And then conclude their letter thus;

<sup>x</sup> Apud Augustinum, Epist. 90. [175. ed. Bened. Also in the Concilia, edit. Mansi, tom. iv. p. 321.]

CHAP.  
XIX.

---

<sup>316.</sup>  
(A.D.416.)

‘ They say also, “ That infants are not to be baptized for that salvation which is given by Christ as a Saviour;” and so they kill them eternally by their pernicious doctrine. They maintain that, “ Though they should not be baptized, yet they would have an eternal life : and that they are not of those of whom our Lord says, *The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost.* For these, say they, were not lost, neither is there any thing in them that needs saving or redeeming at so great a price. For there is nothing in them that is corrupted, nothing that is held captive under the power of the Devil ; nor was the blood which was shed for forgiveness of sins, shed for them.” Though Cælestius has by his book, formerly given in to the church of Carthage, owned that infants have redemption by the baptism of Christ. But a great many who are said to be, or to have been, their disciples, do not cease with all their might to uphold these evils ; by which they endeavour to overthrow the Christian faith.

‘ So that suppose Pelagius and Cælestius be reformed, or do say that they never held these things, and do deny that any of the writings produced against them are theirs, and the contrary cannot be proved ; yet in the general, whoever maintains these tenets, and does affirm, “ That human nature can be sufficient of itself to overcome sin, and keep God’s commandments,” and so is an adversary to the grace of God which is plainly proved from the prayers of holy men : and, “ Quicunque negat parvulos per baptismum Christi a perditione liberari, et salutem percipere sempi-

y Five years before.

‘ ternam ;” whoever denies that infants are by Chris- CHAP.  
 ‘ tian baptism delivered from perdition, and brought XIX.  
 ‘ to eternal salvation ; let him be anathema.’ <sup>316.</sup>  
 (A.D.416.)

‘ And for the other things that are objected to  
 ‘ them, we doubt not but your reverence will, when  
 ‘ you shall have seen the episcopal acts which are  
 ‘ said to have passed in the east, judge so as to  
 ‘ give occasion to us all to rejoice in the mercy of  
 ‘ God.’ [§. 6.]

The Synodical Epistle of the Milevitan council 316.  
 to Innocent<sup>z</sup>.

They represent to him that there was ‘a new  
 ‘ heresy sprung up of men that were enemies to  
 ‘ the grace of Christ, who went about to deprive  
 ‘ people of the benefit of the Lord’s Prayer,’ &c.  
 And after many things said on that subject, they  
 add,

‘ Also they do by a wicked presumption contend  
 ‘ that little infants shall have an eternal life, though  
 ‘ they be not renewed by the sacraments of the  
 ‘ Christian grace ; making that of no effect, which  
 ‘ the apostle says, *By one man sin entered into the*  
 ‘ *world,*’ &c. [§. 2.]

‘ Therefore to omit many other things which  
 ‘ they discourse against the holy scriptures ; these  
 ‘ two things, which do support the hearts of the  
 ‘ faithful, and in which they go about to subvert  
 ‘ all our Christianity, viz. “That God is not to be  
 ‘ prayed to, to be our helper against the evil of sin,  
 ‘ and for working righteousness ;” and, “that the  
 ‘ sacrament of the Christian grace is not helpful to  
 ‘ infants for obtaining eternal life ;” these when we

<sup>z</sup> Apud Augustinum, Epist. 92. [176. ed. Bened.]



CHAP.  
XIX.

‘ have signified to your apostolical breast, we have  
‘ not need to say much,’ &c. [§. 3.]

<sup>316.</sup>  
(A.D. 416.)

There was another letter<sup>a</sup> written to Innocent at the same time, and on the same subject, in a more familiar style, by five bishops, who, I suppose, had some personal acquaintance with him, viz. Aurelius, who had made one at the council of Carthage; Alypius, St. Austin, and Possidius, who had been in the other council; and Euodius, whose name is to neither of them. They give him to understand that they hear there are several at Rome, who do favour Pelagius; some who are brought over to his opinion; others that will not believe he is of that opinion. That in all probability Pelagius had imposed upon the bishops at Diospolis; who, when they heard him own the ‘ grace of God,’ could think no other but that he meant that grace by which we are made good Christians, and not that only by which we are made rational men: whereas he, in his books (which the bishops of Diospolis had not seen) says to God in effect, ‘ Thou hast made us ‘ men, but we have made ourselves good men.’ Therefore they advise him to send for Pelagius to Rome, or to deal with him by letters; that if he will explain himself in a catholic sense he may be acquitted indeed. [§. 1—3.]

To that purpose St. Austin sends to Innocent a letter that he had written to Pelagius, desiring him to send it to him; ‘ For then,’ says he, ‘ he will ‘ the rather vouchsafe to read it, regarding more ‘ him that sent it than him that wrote it.’ [§. 6, and 15.]

They sent him withal a book of Pelagius; I

<sup>a</sup> Inter Epistolas Augustini, Epist. 95. [177. ed. Bened.]

suppose, that *de Viribus Naturæ*, spoken of in CHAP.  
XIX.  
§. 22.

Innocent returned three letters in answer to these <sup>316.</sup>  
three. They are the 91st, 93rd, and 96th<sup>b</sup>, that <sup>317.</sup>  
are printed among the letters of St. Austin. He  
agrees perfectly with them in the points of doctrine,  
and in the proofs that they had brought for them.  
And for the case of infants particularly, he says<sup>c</sup>,  
that which Pelagius and Cælestius do teach, viz.  
that they may have eternal life without baptism, is  
'perfatuum, very absurd.' He says, they would by  
this means 'make their baptism of no use.' That  
'if it did them no hurt that they are not regene-  
'rated, then the same men must hold that the  
'waters of regeneration do them no good.' [§. 5.]  
It seems probable by these words, that this pope  
did not understand how Pelagius distinguished  
between *eternal life* and *the kingdom of heaven*.  
In fine, he gives his sentence, that they are to be  
accounted excommunicate, till they do repent and  
recant.

And to what St. Austin and the other four had  
desired, that he would send for Pelagius, or write  
to him, he answers ;

'He ought rather to come himself that he may  
'be absolved : for if he be still of the same opinion,  
'when will he ever commit himself to our judg-  
'ment, how many letters soever be sent him, when  
'he knows he must be condemned ? And if he  
'were to be sent for, it might be better done by  
'them that are nearer him, and not separated by  
'so great a space of land. But yet, if he will give

<sup>b</sup> [In the Benedictine edition, Nos. 181, 182, 183.]

<sup>c</sup> Epist. 93. [182.]

CHAP. XIX. 'any room for medicine, our care shall not be wanting: for he may condemn the opinions he has  
 (A.D. 416.)<sup>316.</sup> 'been of, and send his letters, and ask pardon for 'his error, as becomes one that returns to us.'  
 [§. 4.]

'For his book which you sent, I have read it: 'in which I find a great many blasphemous things<sup>d</sup>, &c. [§. 5.]

XXIX. These letters of Innocent are dated in 317. January, 417, and he died the March following. And whether he had before his death wrote to Pelagius, or whether Pelagius had heard of what passed, he did write to Innocent an apologetic letter, and sent withal *Libellum fidei*, 'a written 'account of his faith<sup>e</sup>.' In which he endeavours both to shew his own faith to be blameless, and also to be even with St. Hierome for his Dialogue: so that Julian calls it an answer to them<sup>f</sup>. But Innocent being dead before they came, they were delivered to Zosimus, who had been chosen bishop in his stead. Cælestius also came thither himself, and published and gave into the hands of Zosimus his 'Libellus,' or 'Draught of Faith' likewise.

Some learned men<sup>g</sup> make Cælestius to have published two treatises at Rome at this time; one called *Confessio fidei Zosimo Papæ oblata*: and the other, *Ad Zosimum Papam libellus*. And that the

<sup>d</sup> Epist. 96. [183.]

<sup>e</sup> [August. de Gratia, &c. I. c. 30. §. 32. De Peccato orig. ii. c. 18. §. 19.]

<sup>f</sup> Apud Augustin. Operis imperfecti, contra Julianum, lib. iv. c. 88. [tom. x. p. 872.]

<sup>g</sup> F. Garnier [in the treatise subjoined to Marius Mercator, referred to above, at p. 353.] and Dr. Cave, Hist. literar. in Pelagio et Cælestio. [tom. i. p. 293, 295.]



*Confessio fidei* was in a manner the same with CHAP. Pelagius' *Libellus* in sentences and words. And XIX. that Pelagius' *Libellus* is that which goes under (A.D. 417.)<sup>317.</sup> the name of St. Hierome's *Explanatio Symboli ad Damasum*: and Cælestius' *Confessio fidei* is for the greatest part the same with that which goes for St. Austin's *Sermo 191*. [Append. 236.] *de Tempore*.

But Cælestius published but one: which may be called, *Confessio fidei*, or *Libellus fidei*. St. Austin always calls it by the latter name. And that did considerably differ from Pelagius' *Libellus*; being (as St. Austin observes<sup>h</sup>, and we shall see) 'much 'more frank and open in the denial of original sin.'

And whereas they make one to be like the *Explanatio Symboli* in St. Hierome; and the other to be in a manner the same with the *Sermo 191*. [236, App.] in St. Austin's works; these two are not only in a manner the same, but are the very same, (being Pelagius' *Libellus* aforesaid,) saving a few various lections, and saving that that in St. Austin's works has an impertinent preface affixed to the beginning, and a bit cut off from the end by some idle monk, to make it serve for a sermon.

I shall recite it here at large<sup>i</sup>, (though a small part of it only do relate to our purpose,) and add a few short notes on it. And this I do for two reasons:

1. For the credit of Pelagius, and of our country. St. Austin always speaks of him as a man of extraordinary capacity and accomplishments; and one

<sup>h</sup> De Peccato orig. c. 2.

<sup>i</sup> [From Hieronymi Opera, tom. xi. p. 146, ed. Vall. or Augustin. Serm. 236: Op. tom. v. Append. p. 274. ed. Benedict.]

CHAP. whom he should much admire and love, were it not  
 XIX. for his heterodox opinions. And the works of his  
 (A.D.<sup>317</sup>.<sub>417</sub>.) that are left, do shew him a man of very good parts.  
 There are none left entire but this, and a letter of  
 his to Demetrias. Both that letter is as polite and  
 (as Orosius expresses it) elaborate a piece as any  
 that age afforded; and also this confession of his  
 faith is as handsomely and learnedly penned as any  
 of the creeds drawn up by private men of that time,  
 whereof there were many; save that he does not  
 speak home to the clearing of that point on which  
 317. he was questioned. And yet, though these are by  
 much the most ancient pieces extant that ever were  
 written by one born in our country, they have  
 never yet been published in our language.

Secondly, I do it that I may put our Socinians  
 out of love with him. They do much hug some  
 notions of his, which being first dressed up and  
 represented plausible for their turn in French, they  
 have translated and published in English<sup>k</sup>. But  
 they shall see that how well soever he please them  
 in some of their lesser errors; yet as to their main  
 article he is their mortal enemy, and counts them  
 worthy of an anathema: being as decretory against  
 them as Athanasius, or Austin, or any of the an-  
 cient catholic Christians were, whose names they  
 hate.

His creed<sup>l</sup> is this, sent with a letter to pope  
 Innocent, but finding him dead, as I said.

<sup>k</sup> [See above, p. 350.]

<sup>l</sup> This creed for so ancient a one (for it is much ancients  
 than that which goes under the name of Athanasius, and within  
 thirty-six years of the Constantinopolitan) is very express and  
 particular in reference to the holy Trinity: and St. Austin finds

‘ We believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker CHAP.  
XIX.  
‘ of all things visible and invisible. We believe also

no fault with it as to that matter ; he only says, ‘ After he has <sup>317.</sup>(A.D. 417.)  
‘ ended a discourse as long as he pleased, from the unity of the  
‘ Trinity to the resurrection of the flesh, which nobody de-  
‘ manded of him, he says,’ &c.\*

It is to be noted that he had, before he fell into any heresy, written ‘ three Books concerning the Faith of the Trinity ;’ which Gennadius, in the catalogue he gives † of Pelagius’ books, commends as useful ones. And since they are lost, this Creed may serve for an abridgment of them.

And here I will make a remark on the title of another book of his, which Gennadius there mentions, which is lost, except a few fragments. For why should not I, as well as others, take a little pride in the mending the writing of an ancient book ? Pelagius gathered together, and published some select places of scripture relating to moral duties and the practical part of religion. Gennadius recites the title of this book. It is in the ordinary editions, ‘ *Pro actuali conversatione Eulogiarum ex Divinis Scripturis liber unus, capitulorum indicibus in modum Cypriani Martyris præsignatus.*’ *Eulogiarum* there is no sense. So some have put instead of it the Greek *εὐλογίων* ; and others have made other guesses. But I have a very old edition of some of St. Hierome’s Works, Ven. 1476, in which this passage of Gennadius is recited at two several places ; in one it is *Eulogiarum*, in the other it is *Æglogarum* : so that I make no doubt but the true writing was *Eclogarum*. And so the title of the book was plainly this, ‘ Collections of the Texts of holy scripture concerning a man’s actual conversation.’ This is that book of his, to which St. Hierome refers, when he in the passage even now recited, speaking to Pelagius, says, ‘ The blessed martyr Cyprian, whom you pretend to have imitated in collecting into order some places of holy scripture ‡,’ &c.

The same edition § that I mentioned would help to correct several places in the text of St. Hierome himself, which are depraved, and some of them, I doubt, on purpose.

\* De Gratia Christi, cap. 32.

† De Script. Eccl. cap. 42.

‡ [Sect. 26. p. 327.]

§ [This edition of 1476 is expressly noticed by Vallarsius, in the preface to his own, the last and best collection of St. Jerome’s works.]



CHAP. XIX. 'in our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom all things  
 (A.D. 317. 417.) 'were created; very God, the only begotten, the  
 'true Son of God, not a made or adopted one, but  
 'begotten: of one substance with the Father, which  
 'the Greeks express by *ὁμοούσιον*: and in such a  
 'manner equal in all things with the Father, that he  
 'cannot be [accounted] inferior either in time, or  
 'degree, or power. And we acknowledge him that  
 'is begotten to be of the same greatness as he is  
 'that begot him.

'And whereas we say, the Son is *begotten* of the  
 'Father; we do not ascribe any time to that divine  
 'and ineffable generation: but do mean, that nei-  
 'ther the Father nor the Son had any beginning.  
 'For we cannot otherwise confess the Father to be  
 'eternal; unless we do also confess the Son to be  
 'co-eternal: for he is called the Father, as having  
 'a Son; and he who ever was a Father, ever had  
 'a Son.

'We believe also in the Holy Spirit, very God,  
 'proceeding from the Father<sup>m</sup>, equal in all things  
 'with the Father and the Son, in power, in will, in  
 'eternity, in substance. Neither is there any de-  
 'gree [or *graduation*] in the Trinity; nothing  
 'that can be called superior or inferior, but the  
 'whole Deity is equal in its perfection: so that  
 'except the words that signify the propriety of the  
 'persons, whatsoever is said of one person, may  
 'very well be understood of all three.'

<sup>m</sup> *Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father*] No creed at this time had any more. His procession from the Son also, has been since put into the Constantinopolitan by the Latins. So also afterward, he says nothing of Christ's descent into hades, or hell: which was not as yet put into any creed of the catholics, except that of Aquileia.

‘ And as, in confutation of Arius, we say that the  
‘ substance of the Trinity is one and the same, and  
‘ do own one God in three persons ; so avoiding the  
‘ impiety of Sabellius, we distinguish three persons  
‘ expressed by their property : not saying that the  
‘ Father is a Father to himself, nor the Son a Son  
‘ to himself, nor the Holy Spirit the Spirit of him-  
‘ self ; but that there is one person of the Father,  
‘ another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit.  
‘ For we acknowledge not only [several] names, but  
‘ also properties of the names, that is, persons ; or,  
‘ as the Greeks express them, hypostases. Nor does  
‘ the Father at any time exclude the person of the  
‘ Son<sup>n</sup>, or of the Holy Spirit ; nor again does the Son,  
‘ or Holy Spirit, receive the name or person of the  
‘ Father ; but the Father is always Father, the Son  
‘ always Son, and the Holy Spirit always Holy  
‘ Spirit : so that they are in substance one thing,  
‘ but are distinguished by persons and by names.’

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>317.</sup>  
(A.D. 417.)

‘ And we say that this Son of God, who, with the  
‘ Father and the Holy Spirit, inherited eternity  
‘ without any beginning, did, in the end of the  
‘ world, take upon him, of Mary, who was always  
‘ a virgin, perfect man of our nature ; and the Word  
‘ was made flesh, by taking manhood to him, not by  
‘ altering his Deity.’

‘ And we do not say that the ° Holy Spirit was

<sup>n</sup> *Exclude the person of the Son.*] In all the editions both of St. Hierome's and St. Austin's works, which I could see, it is *excludit*. But I guess it is false printed for *includit*, *inluit*, *accipit*, or some such word. [*Excludit* stands as before, both in the Benedictine edition of Augustine, and in Vallarsius' St. Jerome, without the least notice of any variety of reading.]

° *Holy Spirit instead of seed.*] I do not remember any

CHAP. 'instead of seed, as a certain person does most  
 XIX. 'impiously hold; [or as some very impious persons  
 (A.D.<sup>317</sup>. 417.) 'hold;] but that he operated by the power and  
 'influence of the Creator.'

'And we do in such a manner hold that there is  
 'in Christ one person of the Son, as that we say  
 'there are in him two perfect and entire substances,  
 '[or natures,] viz. of the Godhead, and of the man-  
 'hood which consists of soul and body.'

'And as we do condemn Photinus, who confesses in  
 'Christ only a mere man; so we do anathematize  
 'Apollinaris, and all of that sort, who say that the  
 'Son of God did take on him any thing less than  
 'the whole human nature; and that the man [or  
 'manhood] which was assumed, was either in body,  
 'or in soul, or in mind<sup>p</sup>, unlike to those for whose

sect that held this. Tertullian had, in an allusive way of speak-  
 ing, said, 'Being the Son of God from the seed, that is, the  
 'Spirit of God his Father; flesh without the seed of man was  
 'to be taken by him, that he might be the Son of Man. For  
 'the seed of any man was not proper for him who had the  
 'seed of God\*.' And St. Hilary in the same way of speaking,  
 had called it, 'The seminative power of the Spirit coming on  
 'her†.' But Pelagius seems to aim at some person or persons  
 then living. In one of my copies it is, 'Ut quidam scelera-  
 'tissimi opinantur.' But in that elder one that I mentioned, it  
 is, 'Ut quidam sceleratissime opinatur.' I am afraid St. Hierome  
 might have somewhere said some such thing by way of allusion:  
 for Pelagius' chief spite was at him. But I do not remember it.  
 [Both Vallarsius and the Benedictine editors of St. Augustine  
 read *opinantur*.]

<sup>p</sup> *Or in soul, or in mind.*] The words are, 'Vel in anima,  
 'vel in sensu.' But they must be intended for the translation  
 of  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$  and  $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ : for Apollinaris said, that Christ's human nature  
 had  $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu$ , but not  $\nu\omicron\upsilon\nu$ .

\* De Carne Christi, cap. 18.

† Lib. ii. de Trinitate, [sect. 24, 26. p. 800. edit. Benedict.]



‘ sake it was assumed; whom we do hold to have CHAP.  
‘ been like unto us, saving only the stain of sin, XIX.  
‘ which is not natural to us<sup>q</sup>.

<sup>317.</sup>  
(A.D. 417.)

‘ We do also abhor in like manner the blasphemy  
‘ of those who go about by a new interpretation to  
‘ maintain, that since the time of his taking flesh,  
‘ all things pertaining to the Divine nature did pass  
‘ into the man<sup>r</sup> [or manhood], and so also that all

<sup>q</sup> *Sin which is not natural to us.*] He takes some advantage of this for his opinion against original sin. But that which was not natural to man, as God made him, is become, in some sense, natural since his depravation.

<sup>r</sup> *All things pertaining to the Divine nature pass into the man, and e contra.*] He is large against this impiety, which was held by the Arians and the Apollinarists. The Arians had this aim in teaching it, that by owning the Divine nature of Christ to have suffered, the Christians might fall into their opinion, that this Divine nature was not the same with that of God the Father. Phœbadius had a little before this written a tract against 259. the form of faith drawn up at Sirmium; wherein he mentions \* an epistle of Potamius the Arian, that had disseminated this doctrine, that the Divinity of Christ had suffered. ‘ This you ‘ do,’ says he, ‘ that people should not believe him born of him ‘ who is undoubtedly incapable of suffering.’ And Epiphanius says the same thing of the Arians, Hær. 69.

The Eutychians also ran far into this notion of the communication of properties: but that was a good while after Pelagius’ time.

As it is hard for eager spirits to keep the mean, it was but ten 348. years after this, that Nestorius made a very ill use of this same notion of the properties of each nature being incommunicable, to establish an impiety in the other extreme, viz. that the λόγος and the man Christ are two persons. Under pretence of inveighing against one error, he runs into the other. For speaking of his adversaries, he says. ‘ They make use of the union of

\* [Phœbadii Aginnensis episcopi liber adversus Arianos, sect. 5.—Apud Bibl. Patrum, ed. Lugd. tom. iv. p. 301. ed. Gallandii, tom. v. p. 251.]

CHAP. XIX. ' things belonging to the human nature were trans-  
 ferred into God [or the Divine nature]. From  
<sup>317.</sup>  
 (A.D. 417.) ' whence would follow (a thing that no heresy ever  
 offered to affirm) that both substances, [or na-  
 tures,] viz. of the divinity and the humanity,  
 would by this confusion seem to be extinguished,  
 and to lose their proper state, and be changed into  
 another thing. So that they who own in the Son  
 an imperfect God, and an imperfect man, are to be  
 accounted not to hold truly either God or man.'

' But we do hold that our nature capable of suf-  
 fering was so assumed by the Son of God, as that  
 the Divinity did remain incapable of suffering.  
 For the Son of God suffered (not in appearance  
 only, but really) all those things which the scrip-  
 ture speaks of, i. e. hunger, thirst, weariness, pain,  
 death, and the like : but he suffered in that nature  
 God and man to establish a confused mixture\*, &c. They  
 speak of God the Word, who is consubstantial with the Father,  
 as if he had taken the beginning of his origin from the Virgin  
 mother of Christ ; as if he had been built together with his  
 temple, and buried with his flesh. They say that the same  
 flesh did not remain after his resurrection, but did pass into  
 the nature of the Godhead,' &c. But then he adds, ' the virgin,  
 whom many have ventured to call the mother of Christ, they  
 are not afraid to call the mother of God.'

There wanted only the accuracy of speaking, which Pelagius  
 had here used, to clear and settle that dispute between the Nes-  
 torians and Eutychians. He grants here that the Son of God  
 was born, suffered, died, &c., i. e. the same person who is the  
 Son of God ; but not in that nature by which he is God, or the  
 Son of God. However, when that feud broke out, the Pelagian  
 party joined their interest with the Nestorian, as I shewed  
 before†.

\* Ad Cælestinum Papam, Epist. 1. [apud Concilia, edit. Labb. tom. iii.  
 p. 349. ed. Mansi, iv. 1021.]

† §. 25.

‘ which was capable of suffering, i. e. not in that CHAP.  
‘ nature which did assume, but in that which was XIX.  
‘ assumed. For the Son of God is in respect of his (A.D. 317.  
‘ Godhead incapable of suffering, as the Father; in- 417.)  
‘ comprehensible, as the Father; invisible, as the  
‘ Father. And though the proper person of the  
‘ Son, that is, the WORD of God, did take on him  
‘ humanity capable of suffering; yet the Godhead  
‘ of the WORD in its own nature did not suffer any  
‘ thing by the inhabiting of the humanity; as did  
‘ not the whole Trinity, which we must of necessity  
‘ confess to be incapable of suffering. The Son of  
‘ God therefore died according to the Scriptures, in  
‘ respect of that which was capable of dying.’ ‘ The  
‘ third day he rose again. He ascended into heaven.  
‘ He sits on the right hand of God the Father;  
‘ the same nature of flesh still remaining in which  
‘ he was born and suffered, in which also he rose  
‘ again. For the nature of his humanity is not  
‘ extinguished, but is glorified, being to continue  
‘ for ever with the Divinity. Having therefore  
‘ received of the Father the power of all things in  
‘ heaven and earth, he will come to judge the living  
‘ and the dead; that he may reward the just, and  
‘ punish the sinners.’

‘ We do also believe<sup>s</sup> the resurrection of the flesh,  
‘ in such a manner as to say that we shall be re-  
‘ stored again in the same truth of our limbs<sup>t</sup>, in

<sup>s</sup> [Augustine here reads, *ita credimus ut* :’ but Jerome, as edited by Vallarsius, ‘ *confitemur et credimus ut*,’ &c.]

<sup>t</sup> *In the same truth of our limbs.*] ‘ In eadem veritate membrorum in qua nunc sumus.’ St. Hierome had inveighed against Rufinus and the Origenists for denying this, and saying that it would be an ethereal body, not of such limbs as we



CHAP.  
XIX.

‘ which we are now ; and that we shall for ever  
‘ remain such as we shall be once made after the  
(A.D.<sup>317</sup>. 417.) ‘ resurrection.’

‘ That there is one life for the saints, but rewards  
‘ different according to their labour : as on the other  
‘ side the punishments of wicked men shall be  
‘ according to the measure of their sins.’

‘ Baptisma unum tenemus, quod iisdem sacramenti  
‘ verbis in infantibus quibus etiam in majoribus as-  
‘ serimus<sup>u</sup> esse celebrandum.’

‘ We hold one baptism, which we say ought to  
‘ be administered with the same sacramental words  
‘ to infants<sup>x</sup> as it is to elder persons.’

now have : and he had reflected upon the Pelagians, as leaning toward them in many things. But Rufinus had renounced any such opinion ; and so does Pelagius here.

In the last clause of this article [*for ever remain such*] he reflects not only on Origen, who believed a great many changes in the future state ; but on St. Hierome, who had spoke of hell torments, as if there were hope that they would not be eternal.

<sup>u</sup> [Augustine reads *dicimus* : ed. Benedict.]

<sup>x</sup> *With the same sacramental words to infants.*] St. Hierome had said, as I repeated before\*, that they must either own that infants are baptized for ‘ forgiveness of sins,’ or else make two baptisms. Pelagius was therefore forced to say, as he does here. And Cælestius in his Draught of his Faith, which I shall recite presently †, gives this reason why he grants that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins, ‘ That we may not seem to make ‘ two sorts of baptism.’

St. Austin quotes this saying of Pelagius, and some others verbatim‡ as out of his *Libellus fidei*, and makes some animadversions on them. Which makes it so plain that it is Pelagius’, that no critic, great or small, has of late years taken it to be St. Austin’s own, except the great master of that art, mentioned at §. 2. [M. Le Clerc.]

\* Sect. 26.

† Sect. 31.

‡ De Gratia Christi, cap. 32.

‘ If after baptism a man do fall, we believe he  
‘ may be recovered by repentance <sup>y</sup> [or penance].’

CHAP.  
XIX.

‘ We receive the Old and New Testament in the  
‘ same number of books <sup>z</sup> as the authority of the  
‘ holy catholic church doth deliver.’

(A.D. 317.  
417.)

‘ We believe that our souls are given by God, and  
‘ we hold that they are made by him <sup>a</sup>; anathema-  
‘ tizing those who say that souls are, as it were, a  
‘ part of the substance of God <sup>b</sup>. We do also con-  
‘ demn the error of those who say, that the souls

*y recovered by repentance.*] This is against the Novatians. In the copy that is in St. Austin's works it is said, ‘ Primo per reconciliationem, deinde per pœnitentiam,’ ‘ first by reconciliation [or absolution], and then by repentance [or penance].’ That insertion looks like a monk's hand. But the old edition is as I have translated it. [And Vallarsius retains the same text.]

*z same number of books.*] Rufinus had then lately published an Exposition on the Apostles' Creed, in which he had given a catalogue of the books of the Old and New Testament, which the catholics owned in opposition to the heretics, exactly agreeing with that of the Protestants; and said, ‘ These are those which the Fathers have ranked within the canon; and on which they would have our doctrines of faith to depend. But it is to be known that there are some other books which have been called by the ancients not canonical, but ecclesiastical.’ Where he reckons ‘ Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Tobit, Judith, Maccabees, Hermas, and Judicium Petri. Which,’ he says, ‘ the ancient Christians would have to be read in the churches; and for other books, they would not have them read in churches at all.’

*a souls made by God.*] This is aimed against St. Austin; who inclined to the other opinion, that the soul is by propagation, but never positively asserted either side.

*b The soul not a part of the substance of God.*] Against the Manichees and Priscillianists.

CHAP.  
XIX.

‘ have sinned in a former state <sup>c</sup>, or that they have  
‘ lived in the cœlestial regions, before they were sent  
(A.D.<sup>317</sup>.417.) ‘ into bodies.’

‘ We do also abhor the blasphemy of those who  
‘ say that any impossible thing is commanded to  
‘ man by God ; or, that the commandments of God  
‘ cannot be performed by any one man, but that by  
‘ all men taken together <sup>d</sup> they may. Or, that do  
‘ condemn first marriages in compliance with Mani-  
‘ chæus, or second marriages in compliance with the  
‘ Montanists.’

‘ Also we do anathematize those who say, that the  
‘ Son of God did tell lies by necessity of the flesh ;  
‘ and that because of the human nature which he

<sup>c</sup> *Souls sinned in a former state.*] He clears himself from the suspicion of Origenism as to that particular : but yet some of his party embraced it, that they might the better account for the baptism of infants without owning original sin.

<sup>d</sup> *Commands of God not performed by one man, but by all taken together.*] This is the sentence which Mr. Le Clerc cites as if it were St. Austin's ; to shew that he contradicts St. Hierome ; as I mentioned, §. 2. And indeed it does not only contradict him, but is levelled at him as a blasphemer : for St. Hierome writing\* against that opinion of Pelagius, that a man may live without sin, had used a long discourse, to shew that those men that are free from some sort of faults are subject to other sorts, and that no man can have all virtues. Pelagius is here in hopes to make heresy and blasphemy out of that.

Also, the other clause of this paragraph about condemning marriage, is meant against St. Hierome ; who, in many of his works, and particularly in those against Jovinian †, had so excessively commended virginity, that some of his expressions were reproachful to the state of marriage, especially of second marriages ; and he had been forced to write an apology to explain his meaning.

\* Dial. 1. [contra Pelagianos : Op. tom. ii.]

† [Adversus Jovinianum libri duo. Op. tom. ii.]



‘ had taken on him, he could not do all things that  
‘ he would e.’

CHAP.  
XIX.

317.  
(A.D.417.)

e *Did tell lies by necessity of the flesh, and that because of the human nature which he had assumed, he could not do all things that he would.*] This is a severe animadversion on St. Hierome; who, in the second of the dialogues which he wrote against Pelagius, being eager in shewing the presumption of that tenet of his, ‘ That it is possible for a man to avoid all sin if he will,’ had argued thus; ‘ I cannot,’ says Christ, ‘ do any thing of myself, &c. ‘ The Arians here raise a cavil; but the church answer, that ‘ this is spoken in respect of the human nature which he ‘ had assumed. You, on the contrary say, “ I can be without ‘ sin, if I will.” He can do nothing of himself, that he may ‘ shew the truth of human nature. You can avoid all sin; that ‘ you may, even while you are in the body, set yourself forth as ‘ a God.

‘ He told his brethren and kindred that he would not go to ‘ the feast of tabernacles; and yet it is written afterward, “ But ‘ when his brethren were gone up, then he also went up to the ‘ feast.” He said he would not go; and yet afterwards did ‘ what he denied he would do. Porphyry snarls at this, and ‘ accuses him of inconstancy and change: not considering that ‘ all things that give offence are to be referred to the flesh [or ‘ imputed to the human nature].’

St. Hierome does not however call this a lie, as Pelagius would represent his words; but an alteration of purpose incident to human nature.

And at another place in the same dialogue, having quoted that saying of our Saviour, *Father, if it be possible, remove this cup from me*: he adds, ‘ Why, I pray you, does he use the words ‘ of one that were in doubt? He had said in another place, ‘ *The things that are impossible with men, are possible with God.* ‘ But being a man, and to suffer, he speaks in the language of ‘ a man. He says, *If it be possible, let one hour pass from ‘ me.* You say it is possible to avoid sin all one’s life.’ Not only Pelagius was of opinion that these sayings were irreverent, and did impute sin to our Saviour as a man; but Theodorus also, bishop of Mopsuestia, who was a Pelagian likewise, wrote a treatise, ‘ Against those that say Men sin by Nature, and not

CHAP.  
XIX.

‘ We do also condemn the heresy of Jovinian, who says, that in the life to come there will be no <sup>317.</sup> (A.D. 417.) ‘ by their Will.’ He calls the adversary, whom he there expresses by a feigned name, *Aram*; but he means St. Hierome. Photius gives an abstract of the book \*. And therein Theodorus imputes to his adversary this saying. ‘ That even Christ, having ‘ assumed the human nature which is infected with sin, was ‘ not free from wickedness.’ But this is to put a very malicious interpretation upon St. Hierome’s words, which were indeed not very warily spoken.

The writer of the first of those two letters of the Pelagians against which St. Austin wrote his four books to pope Boniface, made afterward the same spiteful reflection, saying of his adversaries (i. e. the Catholics) in general, that they held (among a great many horrid things which he there heaps up) ‘ That Christ ‘ was not clear from sin; but that he told lies by the necessity ‘ of the flesh, and was stained with other sins.’ To which St. Austin there † answers, ‘ Let them look to it whom he has ‘ heard say such things, or in whose books he has read something perhaps which he did not understand, and has turned ‘ to this slanderous sense by a deceitful malice.’ St. Austin speaks so, as that one may guess he knew where they had this, but was not willing to enter into a dispute to vindicate St. Hierome’s words.

The eighteen Pelagian bishops had this over again in their letter to the bishop of Thessalonica, as we may see by St. Austin’s second book to Boniface, cap. vi. And Julian again, as appears by St. Austin’s answer to him, lib. iii. cap. 6. [tom. x. p. 368.]

St. Hierome at many other places owns in plain words, that our Saviour had no sin: and therefore this spiteful advantage ought not to be taken of his words in this one place. Even in these very dialogues, Dial. 2. having shewed that all that are mere men have some failings, he adds, ‘ To have all things, and

\* Bibliotheca cod. 177. [p. 396. edit. Hæschelii, 1653. Some fragments of this work were published by Noris in his *Historia Pelagiana*; again by Garnier, in his edition of Marius Mercator; and they are very properly appended by Vallarsius to St. Jerome’s dialogues against the Pelagians, in the second volume of his collection of that Father’s works.]

† *Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum lib. i. ad Bonifac. cap. 12.*

‘ difference of merits ; [or rewards ;] and that we  
 ‘ shall have there virtues [or graces] which we took  
 ‘ no care to have here<sup>e</sup>. CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>317.</sup>  
(A.D. 417.)

‘ to be wanting in nothing, is peculiar to the virtue of him,  
 ‘ *who did no sin, neither was any guile found in his mouth.*’

St. Hierome had moreover in the third of these dialogues cited a place in the ‘ Gospel of the Nazarenes,’ where Christ is brought in speaking thus, ‘ What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized of John, unless this that I have spoken be a sin of ignorance ?’ But he does not pretend there that this book is authentical, or to be credited. And yet the Pelagians afterward objected this to him, as if he had by this quotation gone about to establish ‘ a fifth Gospel, which taught ‘ that Christ did sin.’

<sup>e</sup> *And that we shall have there virtues which we took no care to have here.*] St. Hierome had not said so, but he had said something which Pelagius would draw to that sense. He had said, ‘ So long as we have this treasure in earthen vessels, and are encompassed with frail and mortal and contemptible flesh, we think ourselves happy, if in some single virtues, or parts of virtue, we do service to God. But when this corruptible shall be clothed on with incorruption, and death shall be swallowed up in the victory of Christ, then God will be all things in all men : so that Solomon will have not only the grace of wisdom, David of meekness, &c., and each two or three virtues ; but all will be in each, and the whole number of saints shall triumph in the whole chorus of virtues\*.’ Though these words give no sufficient ground for this calumny, yet the Pelagians ceased not to inculcate their accusation of the doctrine of the catholics upon occasion taken from them. Julian and the seventeen bishops harped upon the same string. For we find St. Austin answering them thus ; ‘ Who can bear it, when they object to us as if we did say that after the resurrection there will be such a proficiency, that men shall there begin to keep those commands of God, which they refused to keep here ; and all this because we say that there will be there no sin at all, nor any conflict with the concupiscence of sin ? As if they themselves did dare to deny this†.’

\* Dial. 1. [sect. 18. p. 699. ed. Vallars.] † Lib. 3. ad Bonifac. cap. 7.



CHAP. XIX. 'Freewill we do so own as to say, that we  
 always stand in need of God's help<sup>f</sup>: and that as  
 (A.D. 417.)<sup>317.</sup> 'well they are in an error, who say with Manichæus,  
 'that a man cannot avoid sin; as they who affirm  
 'with Jovinian, that a man cannot sin. For both  
 'of these take away the freedom of the will. But  
 'we say, that a man always is in a state that he  
 'may sin, or may not sin; so as to own ourselves  
 'always to be of a freewill.'

'This is, most blessed pope, our faith, which we  
 'have learned in the catholic church, and have  
 'always held. In which if there be any thing that  
 'is perhaps unwarily or unskilfully expressed; we  
 'desire it may be amended by you, who do hold  
 'both the faith and the see of Peter. And if this  
 'our confession be approved by the judgment of  
 'your apostleship; then whoever shall have a mind  
 'to find fault with me, will shew, not me to be a  
 'heretic, but himself unskilful or spiteful, or even  
 'no catholic.'

XXX. Together with this confession of his faith, Pelagius sent a letter to Innocent, apologizing for himself, and endeavouring to shew that he did not in all points hold as his adversaries gave out, and to justify what he did hold. He was very desirous to continue in the catholic church, and not be separated from it. He used great art in reciting the articles objected against him, so as that he could

<sup>f</sup> *We do always stand in need of God's help.*] St. Austin quotes this sentence, and then says, 'Here again we would know what sort of help he owns us to stand in need of, and again we find him ambiguous; for he may say that he means the law, and Christian doctrine, by which our natural power is helped.' &c.\*

\* De Gratia Christi, cap. 33.

easily answer them or deny them; and in wording his own opinion, so as he could easily defend them. CHAP.  
XIX.  
The letter is lost, except such parts of it as St. Au- (A.D. 417.)  
stin has preserved, by quoting them as he had occasion to write animadversions on them. I shall recite only that passage of St. Austin, where he quotes that part of the letter which speaks of the baptism of infants, which is this:

*Augustin. de Peccato originali, cap. 17, 18, &c.*

‘ Observe how Pelagius attempted slyly to deceive  
‘ even the episcopal judgment of the apostolic see  
‘ in this very question of the baptism of infants.  
‘ For in the letter which he sent to Rome to holy  
‘ pope Innocent of blessed memory, which finding  
‘ him not in the body, was delivered to holy pope  
‘ Zosimus, and by him transmitted to us: he says,

‘ Se ab hominibus infamari, quod neget parvulis  
‘ baptismi sacramentum, et absque redemptione  
‘ Christi aliquibus cœlorum regna promittat.’ ‘ That  
‘ men do slander him, as if he denied the sacrament  
‘ of baptism to infants, and did promise the king-  
‘ dom of heaven to any persons without the redemp-  
‘ tion of Christ.’

‘ But these things are not so objected to them as  
‘ he has set them down. For they do not deny the  
‘ sacrament of baptism to infants; neither do they  
‘ promise the kingdom of heaven to any without the  
‘ redemption of Christ. So that the thing he com-  
‘ plains he is slandered in, he has set down so as  
‘ that he might easily answer to the crime objected,  
‘ and yet keep his opinion. But the thing that is  
‘ objected to them is this, that they will not own  
‘ that unbaptized infants are liable to the condem-  
‘ nation of the first man, and that there has passed

CHAP. XIX. ' upon them original sin, which is to be cleansed by  
 (A.D. 417.)<sup>317.</sup> ' regeneration; but do contend that they are to be  
 ' baptized only for their receiving the kingdom of  
 ' heaven, &c.—And then mark how he answers,  
 ' and mind his lurking-holes of ambiguity, &c. For,  
 ' having said,

‘ Nunquam se vel impium aliquem hæreticum au-  
 ‘ disse, qui hoc quod proposuit de parvulis, diceret:’  
 ‘ That he never heard, no not even any impious  
 ‘ heretic, or sectary, who would say that (which  
 ‘ he had mentioned) of infants:’

He then goes on, and says,

‘ Quis enim ita evangelicæ lectionis ignarus est,  
 ‘ qui hoc non modo affirmare conetur, sed qui vel  
 ‘ leviter dicere aut etiam sentire possit? Deinde  
 ‘ quis tam impius, qui parvulos exortes regni cœlo-  
 ‘ rum esse velit, dum eos baptizari et in Christo re-  
 ‘ nasci vetat?’ ‘ For who is there so ignorant of  
 ‘ that which is read in the gospel, as (I need not say  
 ‘ to affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such  
 ‘ a thing, or even to have such a thought? In a  
 ‘ word, who can be so impious as to hinder infants  
 ‘ from being baptized and born again in Christ, and  
 ‘ so make them miss of the kingdom of heaven?’

‘ All this talk is nothing to his purpose. He does  
 ‘ not clear himself by this. That infants without  
 ‘ baptism cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,  
 ‘ is a thing which they themselves never denied.  
 ‘ But that is not the question. The question is  
 ‘ about the cleansing of original sin in infants: let  
 ‘ him clear himself on that point. He will not own  
 ‘ that the laver of regeneration has any thing which  
 ‘ it need wash off in infants. And let us see what  
 ‘ he says next. After reciting that testimony of the



‘gospel, that, *Nisi renatus ex aqua et Spiritu* CHAP.  
‘*Sancto, regnum cœlorum nullus possit intrare :* XIX.  
‘*None can enter into the kingdom of heaven, that* (A.D.<sup>317.</sup><sub>417.</sub>)  
‘*is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit :*  
‘about which there is, as I said, no question; he  
‘goes on, and says, “*Quis ille tam impius est, qui*  
‘*cujuslibet ætatis parvulo interdicat communem hu-*  
‘*mani generis redemptionem?*” “Who is there so  
‘impious as to refuse to an infant, of what age  
‘soever, the common redemption of mankind?”

‘This too is ambiguous, what redemption he  
‘means: whether from a bad estate to a good one;  
‘or from a good one to a better. For Cælestius  
‘did own, in his book at Carthage, the redemption  
‘of infants; and yet would not own that sin did  
‘pass from Adam on them. But mind his next  
‘words, “*Et in perpetuam certamque vitam renasci*  
‘*vetet eum qui natus sit ad incertam?*” “And to  
‘hinder him that is born to an uncertain life, from  
‘being born again to an everlasting and certain one?”

[§. 20.]

St. Austin is something long in conjecturing what he means by these last words: but he pitches on this; that as Pelagius would not own children to be by nature in a state of condemnation, and on the other side granted that they were not born in a state to go to heaven; so he would not determine so positively as some of his abettors did, that they should have an eternal life out of the kingdom of heaven; but left it as an uncertain thing what should become of them: and therefore said, that they were ‘born to an uncertain life;’ but that if they were baptized they would have an ‘everlasting life,’ and that certainly in heaven. And he quotes

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>317.</sup>  
(A.D. 417.)

on this occasion that saying of his which I mentioned before, 'For unbaptized infants, I know whither they do not go; but whither they do go, I know not.' And this phrase of his, *vitam incertam*, is much the same with that which I recited of St. Ambrose<sup>g</sup>, 'Opertam illam pœnarum immunitatem,' 'That state of freedom from punishment, which is not clear.'

The chief thing I observe in this letter is the confession of Pelagius, that he had never heard, no not even any sectary, deny the sacrament of baptism to infants. For the words of the letter, if we put together the paragraphs which stand disjoined in this animadversion of St. Austin on them, were thus:

'Men slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants, or did promise the kingdom of heaven to some persons without the redemption of Christ: which is a thing that I never heard, no not even any wicked heretic, say. For who is there so ignorant of that which is read in the gospel, as (I need not say to affirm this, but) in any heedless way to say such a thing, or even have such a thought? In a word, who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized and born again in Christ, and so make them miss of the kingdom of heaven; since our Saviour has said, that none can enter into the kingdom of heaven that is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit? Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant of what age soever the common redemption of mankind, and to hinder him that is born to an uncertain life from being born again to an everlasting and certain one?'

<sup>g</sup> Ch. xiii. §. 2.

XXXI. The Creed, or book of faith, which Cælestius presented, is nowhere extant. St. Austin CHAP.  
XIX.  
has recited some parts of it, which shew plain (A.D. 417.)<sup>317.</sup>  
enough that it differed from that of Pelagius. I  
will mention one passage which he recites<sup>i</sup>, which  
is to our purpose.

‘ Infantes autem debere baptizari in remissionem  
‘ peccatorum, secundum regulam universalis ecclesiæ,  
‘ et secundum evangelii sententiam, confitemur; quia  
‘ Dominus statuit regnum cœlorum non nisi bapti-  
‘ zatis posse conferri: quod quia vires naturæ non  
‘ habent, conferri necesse est per gratiæ libertatem.  
‘ In remissionem autem peccatorum baptizandos in-  
‘ fantes non ideo diximus, ut peccatum ex traduce  
‘ firmare videamur; quod longe a catholico sensu  
‘ alienum est. Quia peccatum non cum homine  
‘ nascitur, quod postmodum exercetur ab homine:  
‘ quia non naturæ delictum, sed voluntatis esse de-  
‘ monstratur. Et illud ergo confiteri congruum; ne  
‘ diversa baptismatis genera facere videamur: et hoc  
‘ præmunire necessarium est, ne per mysterii occa-  
‘ sionem, ad creatoris injuriam, malum, antequam fiat  
‘ ab homine, tradi dicatur homini per naturam.’

‘ We own that infants ought, according to the  
‘ rule of the universal church, and according to the  
‘ sentence of the gospel, to be baptized for forgive-  
‘ ness of sins, because our Lord has determined that  
‘ the kingdom of heaven cannot be conferred upon  
‘ baptized persons: which because it is a thing that  
‘ nature cannot give, it is needful to give it by  
‘ the liberty of grace. But when we say that in-  
‘ fants are to be baptized for forgiveness of sins, we  
‘ do not say it with such intent as that we would

<sup>i</sup> De Peccato originali, cap. 5 et 6.



CHAP. XIX.  
 (A.D. 417.)<sup>317.</sup> ‘ seem to confirm the opinion of sin being by derivation [or propagation], which is a thing far from the catholic sense. For sin is not born with a man, which is afterward acted by man; because it is demonstrable that sin is a thing not of nature but of choice. Therefore it is both proper to own the former, that we may not seem to make two sorts of baptism; and also necessary to give a caution about the latter, lest on occasion of the sacrament it be, to the reproach of the Creator, said, that evil is by nature conveyed to a man before it be acted by him.’

XXXII. Pelagius expressed himself more sily in his creed: he said that infants are to be baptized with the same words as elder persons are. St. Austin excepts against that<sup>k</sup>, and says, ‘ It is things that we regard, and not words only.’ But beside, Pelagius did not nigh so plainly or openly in his creed to Innocent deny original sin, though he had in other books.

319. But at last Pelagius swallowed this morsel too. For Pinianus, Albina, and Melania<sup>1</sup> do certify St. Austin that upon their importunity used with Pelagius to renounce the opinions for which he was censured, he had in their hearing said, *Infantes in remissionem peccatorum percipere baptismum*: ‘ that infants do receive baptism for remission of sins.’ St. Austin answers<sup>m</sup>, that ‘ that is indeed more than he had said in his Libellus: for now he does not say, “ with the words of forgiveness,” but confesses that they are baptized for forgiveness itself. And

<sup>k</sup> De Gratia Christi, cap. 32.

<sup>1</sup> [The persons to whom St. Austin addressed this treatise.]

<sup>m</sup> Ibidem.

‘ yet if you should ask him what sin he thinks is  
 ‘ forgiven them, he would maintain that they had  
 ‘ none at all. Who could think that under so plain  
 ‘ a confession a contrary sense could lie hid, if  
 ‘ Cælestius had not bolted it out ?’ &c.

CHAP.  
XIX.

(A.D. 417.)

They that would maintain a dispute, or theological wrestle, and would not take this for a fair fall or baffle, it could be no longer worth the while to contend with them. Pelagius had had at the council of Diospolis some silly sayings objected to him out of a book: and when he denied the book to be his, they asked him, ‘ whether since he disowned  
 ‘ those sayings, he would anathematize those that  
 ‘ said such things?’ He answered<sup>n</sup>, ‘ I anathematize them for fools, not for heretics; for there is  
 ‘ no article of faith spoken of in them.’ But now he himself, when he is driven to this plunge as to grant that infants are baptized for pardon of sins, and yet have no sin, shews himself as absurd as they could be.

But the way by which his partners went about to make sense of this odd saying, we have in a letter of St. Austin to Sixtus<sup>o</sup>, written a good while after these times. There St. Austin having said of the Pelagians, that they are so *Circumstipati et divinarum auctoritate lectionum, et antiquitus tradito et retento firmo ecclesiæ ritu in baptismo parvulorum*, ‘ beset both with the authority of God’s word,  
 ‘ and with the usage of the church that was of old  
 ‘ delivered to it, and has been since kept by it, in  
 ‘ the baptizing of children;’ that they dare not

<sup>n</sup> [August. de Gestis Pelagii Palæst. cap. vi. §. 16.]

<sup>o</sup> Epist. 105. [194. tom. ii. p. 544. ed. Benedict. cap. 10. §. 43. 45.]

CHAP. deny that infants are baptized for forgiveness of  
 XIX.  
 (A.D. <sup>317.</sup>417.) church does this *fallaciter*, ‘in any trickish or de-  
 ‘ceitful meaning;’ but *ut fide agatur quod agitur,*  
*utique fit quod dicitur;* ‘since what is acted, is  
 ‘acted seriously, that which is spoken must be sup-  
 ‘posed to be really done.’ He adds,

‘That therefore which they have devised to say,  
 ‘when this manifest force of truth weighed them  
 ‘down, what Christian is there that will not laugh  
 ‘to hear, though he must own it to be very  
 ‘crafty? For they say that “infants do indeed an-  
 ‘swer truly by the mouths of those that bring  
 ‘them, that they believe in the forgiveness of sins;  
 ‘not that any sins are forgiven to them; but that  
 ‘they believe that in the church, or in baptism, sins  
 ‘are forgiven to those that have any, not to those  
 ‘that have none.” And so they do not yield that  
 ‘infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins in such  
 ‘a sense as that any sins are forgiven to them who,  
 ‘they say, have none; but that they, though they  
 ‘be without sin, yet are baptized with that baptism  
 ‘by which is granted forgiveness of sins to all that  
 ‘have any.’

There will ever be this difference between a man of sense, and a thick-skulled man; that the former, if he find himself gravelled, will at least have the modesty to give over talking. Pelagius, after he was brought to this contradiction, kept silence; and we hear no more of him.

But Cælestius blundered through all this, and a great deal more: when he was excommunicated at one place, going to another. And he, after all this, continued to make such a noise in the eastern parts,



that the heresy which was called Pelagian in the west, was there called the Cælestine heresy. After several excommunications in particular churches, he was at last pronounced a heretic in the general council or meeting of all the eastern and western bishops at Ephesus. CHAP.  
XIX.  
(A.D. 417.)

F. Garnier<sup>p</sup> reckons up twenty-four synods, in several parts of the world, held against this error: whereof this of Ephesus was the last, and the twenty-second was at St. Alban's in Britain, (the year of Christ 429, as bishop Ussher<sup>q</sup> and Garnier<sup>329</sup> out of him do shew): so that, if Pelagius lived to this time, he lived to see himself condemned by his own countrymen.

I shall take notice only of two more artifices that these men used to stave off excommunication, and so dismiss them.

XXXIII. 1. They spoke with words of seeming submission to the bishops to whom they appealed. You see with what a compliment Pelagius concludes the confession of his faith to pope Innocent: and Cælestius began his to Zosimus with one of the like nature. For in the preface of it there were these words<sup>r</sup>, 'that if any mistake have by chance happened to me through ignorance, as being a man; it may by your skill be corrected:' and when Zosimus asked him if he would<sup>s</sup> 'renounce all those tenets which had been objected to him formerly by the deacon Paulinus, and would give his assent to the letters of the apostolic see, which had been written by his predecessor of holy memory, he refused to

<sup>p</sup> [In his edition of Marius Mercator, referred to above.]

<sup>q</sup> [Britann. Eccles. Antiquit. p. 176. edit. 1687.]

<sup>r</sup> August. de Peccato orig. cap. 6.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. cap. 7.

CHAP. XIX. 'renounce the articles objected by the deacon, but  
 (A.D. 417.)<sup>317.</sup> 'he did not dare to oppose the letters of holy pope  
 'Innocent. Nay, he promised to renounce all things  
 'which that see did renounce.' This St. Austin  
 repeats from the acts of his examination.

But what do these general words avail, when he, reciting the particulars of his faith, did, as we see, plainly renounce the doctrine of original sin ; in an absolute contrariety to the letters of Innocent, to which he pretended to submit.

Yet, as all men have a weak side on which they receive flatterers ; this verbal compliance took so far with Zosimus, that he undertook the patronage of these men against the African bishops ; and wrote  
 318. several letters on their behalf, and continued so long to hold on their side, till at last he found it too hot to hold any longer ; and then, when he saw they were condemned by the council of Carthage, and by the emperor, and would be condemned by the Christian world, whether he would or no ; he himself wrote an encyclical epistle, as zealous in their condemnation as he had been before in their defence ; a part of which I shall presently recite.

This made Julian and the other following Pelagians say <sup>t</sup>, 'that pope Zosimus and the rest of the 'clergy of Rome were turncoats.' Indeed he acted so as to make it plainly appear, that the infallibility of that see is a gift that has been bestowed upon them since that time : for mind the particulars ;

1. Pope Innocent had by his letters dated in  
 317. January 417, which I mentioned before <sup>u</sup>, fully and plainly condemned the doctrine that denies original

<sup>t</sup> August. contra duas Epist. Pelag. ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 3.

<sup>u</sup> §. 28.

sin; and had condemned Pelagius and Cælestius unless they did recant. CHAP.  
XIX.

2. Pope Zosimus sometime in the summer of the same year, upon Cælestius' application to him, 'sat  
' on a day of hearing in St. Clement's church,' &c.  
——' and caused Cælestius' *Libellus* which he had  
' given in [this is the same *Libellus fidei*, or Creed,  
' of which I just now cited a part, denying original  
' sin] to be read over.' And he writes a letter to  
the African bishops, that he had done so, (which is  
his third epistle extant, tom. 1. *Conciliorum*<sup>x</sup>),  
wherein he blames them as having been too hasty  
in censuring Pelagius and Cælestius, and sends a  
copy of Cælestius' *Libellus* to them, and orders  
thus; ' Either within two months let somebody  
' come that may convict him to his face, of holding  
' other opinions than he has set down in his books  
' and confession; or else, after such plain and ma-  
' nifest declarations made by him, let your holiness  
' know that there is no doubt remaining, viz. but  
' that he is to be acquitted.'

3. A little while after, viz. September 21st, he  
writes another letter to them<sup>y</sup>, that he now had re-  
ceived Pelagius' letter and *Libellus* likewise; and  
a letter from Praylius bishop of Jerusalem, in his  
behalf. That ' these had been publicly read over;  
' and that the contents of them were all to the same  
' purpose, sense, and tenor with what Cælestius had  
' produced before. Oh, brethren! that any of you  
' had been present at the reading of them. What

<sup>x</sup> [Tom. ii. p. 1558. edit. Labb.—tom. iv. p. 350. edit. Mansi.]

<sup>y</sup> Zosimi Epist. quarta, tom. i. *Conciliorum*. [tom. ii. p. 1561. ed. Labb. tom. iv. p. 353. edit. Mansi.)



CHAP. 'joy there was of the holy men that were present !  
XIX. ' ——— Some could scarce forbear weeping, *tales*

<sup>317.</sup>  
(A.D.417.) ' *etiam* [*l. tam*] *absolutæ fidei infamari potuisse*,  
' that it should be possible for such men of so unre-  
' bukable a faith to be slandered.' ——— Then he  
inveighs against their accusers, and at last says, ' If  
' the father rejoice at the return of his son that had  
' been dead, and was alive again, had been lost, and  
' was found, &c., how much greater rejoicing of  
' our faith is this, that these men, of whom false  
' stories were reported, never were dead nor lost ! I  
' have sent therefore to your charity copies of the  
' writings which Pelagius sent,' &c.

317. 4. Zosimus declared that *Libellus* of Cælestius  
(in which he says, as I rehearsed before, that ' the  
' opinion of sin being *ex traduce*, by derivation or  
' propagation, is far from the catholic sense') to be  
catholic, or orthodox. This will appear by the next  
quotation.

317. 5. The African bishops wrote<sup>z</sup> answer to Zosimus  
the latter end of this year, wherein they plead,  
' That Cælestius ought to clear himself at another  
' rate than that of saying in general, that he would  
' assent to the letters of pope Innocent. That he  
' ought to be compelled to recite and condemn those  
' ill things which he had put in his *Libellus* : lest,  
' if he did not do that, a great many persons of  
' weak judgments might be more ready to think  
' that those doctrines, poisonous to our faith, which  
' were in his *Libellus*, were approved by the apostolic  
' see, because that see had said that that *Libellus*  
' was catholic ; than they would be to think them  
' corrected by it, because he said he would assent

<sup>z</sup> August. ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 3, 4.

‘ to pope Innocent’s letter.’ And the next year CHAP. XIX.  
 the same bishops in a fuller meeting send him (A.D. 417.)<sup>317.</sup>  
 another letter to the same purpose; but more per-  
 emptory ; wherein, without any more staying for his  
 consent, or joining with them, they determine that  
 Pelagius and Cælestius are to be accounted excom-  
 municate till they do recant, &c.

6. Then at last, when the emperor also had<sup>318.</sup>  
 declared to the same purpose, Zosimus himself like-  
 wise condemned these men, and the opinions they  
 held against original sin, as well as the rest of the  
 world did, and his own predecessor had done ; and  
 sent, as I said, an encyclical or circular letter about  
 to the churches, declaring his excommunication of  
 them. A part of it is recited by St. Austin, in these  
 words<sup>a</sup> ; ‘ Our Lord is faithful in his words ; and  
 ‘ his baptism has the same plenitude [or force] in  
 ‘ deed that it has in words ; I mean, in its operation,  
 ‘ in the owning the true forgiveness of sins, in  
 ‘ all sexes, ages, and conditions of mankind. For  
 ‘ none is made free, but who was a servant of sin ;  
 ‘ nor can any be said to be redeemed, but who was  
 ‘ before truly a captive by sin ; as it is written, *If*  
 ‘ *the Son do make you free, ye shall be free indeed :*  
 ‘ for by him we are spiritually regenerated, by him  
 ‘ we are crucified to the world ; by his death that  
 ‘ bond, contracted by propagation, of death brought  
 ‘ upon us all by Adam, and transmitted to every  
 ‘ soul, is cancelled ; and there is not any one of all  
 ‘ that are born, but what is bound and liable to that  
 ‘ bond, until he be by baptism freed from it.’ Here  
 he sings the same tune with his predecessors ;  
 thanks to the African bishops.

<sup>a</sup> Epist. 157. ad Optatum. [190, ed. Benedict. cap. vi. §. 23.]

CHAP.  
XIX.318.  
(A.D. 418.)

And the church of Rome from that time has been very zealous in the same doctrine, till now in this last age they are grown great latitudinarians in this matter. The Jesuits have of late set themselves strongly to overthrow St. Austin's doctrine of prædestination; and, not content with that, have pushed their arguments so far as to undermine the doctrine of original sin. And the court of Rome shews so much favour to their endeavours, that it is probable they would (if they could avoid the slur that would thereby be brought on their infallibility) once more declare for Pelagius.

It seems that a book of cardinal Sfondrata<sup>b</sup>, which

<sup>b</sup> [Entitled, 'Nodus Prædestinationis ex sacris Litteris Doctrinae Sanctorum Augustini et Thomæ, quantum homini licet, dissolutus, a Cælestino S. R. E. Card. Sfondrato.' 4<sup>o</sup>. Romæ 1696.

On the appearance of this work, the prelates of France took alarm, and their sentiments not only came before the public, but were communicated officially to the pope. Le Tellier, archbishop of Rheims, their primate, wrote a letter on the subject, which was published under the title of 'Sentiment de M. Le Tellier, Archevêque de Rheims, sur le livre du Cardinal Sfondrate, qui a pour titre, *Nodus Prædestinationis*, &c., contenu dans une lettre de ce prælât, du 14 Janvier 1697.'—12<sup>o</sup>.

This was soon followed by a letter addressed (on Feb. 21. 1697) to Innocent, by the archbishop and other French prelates, (among them were De Noailles and Bossuet,) against the work. Innocent returned an answer on the 6th of May; and both letter and answer were translated into Latin, and published at Paris in the same year, 1697.

In 1698 appeared a burlesque piece, entitled, 'Appendix ad Nodum Sfondratianum; sive Litteræ Parvulorum sine Baptismo mortuorum, scriptæ e limbis ad suæ quietis perturbatores.' 8<sup>o</sup>. Colonia 1698.

In the next year, 'Dispositio notarum quadraginta, quas scriptor anonymus Card. Cælestini Sfondrati libro, cui titulus



denies the propagation of original sin, and any punishment of unbaptized infants, finds so much favour; that though several French bishops demanded judgment of the pope against it, they could obtain none. On the contrary, Innocent XII. recommended the printing of it. And there was lately printed an address to the assembly of French bishops, anno 1700, that they would censure it; but without any success that I have heard of: the title whereof is, *Augustiniana Ecclesiæ Romanæ doctrina*, &c. The book I have not seen, but an abstract of it in the common prints from Holland. It shews, it seems, that such a book as the aforesaid gives occasion to the heretics to say, That Rome is turning Pelagian.

Zosimus might have been fallible in the case of Pelagius himself, and might have been excused; because he in great measure concealed his opinion in his letter and Libellus: so the mistake might be only in matter of fact. But Cælestius' Libellus spoke

‘*Nodus Prædestinationis*, inussit,’ was published in his vindication, 8<sup>o</sup>. Coloniae. And in 1700 came forth the piece named by Dr. Wall, bearing this title: ‘*Collectio variorum Scriptorum adversus librum cui titulus, Nodus Prædestinationis; sive Augustiniana ecclesiæ Romanæ doctrina a Card. Sfondrati Nodo extricata, per varios sancti Augustini discipulos.*’ Coloniae 12<sup>o</sup>. 1700.

The cardinal's book was reprinted in 1705; and two years afterwards Louis P. de Vaucel, the translator and editor of the letters to and from pope Innocent, published a volume of Animadversions upon it, by himself, the archbishop of Rheims and others, 4<sup>o</sup>. Cologne 1707. Whether Sfondrati published any thing more upon this subject, does not quite appear: but the editor of his *Nodus* names in the preface, among other pieces left by the cardinal at his death, ‘*Dissertationes eruditissimæ duæ contra hæreticos de Baptismo Infantium.*’]

CHAP.  
XIX.

318.  
(A.D. 418.)

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>318.</sup>  
(A.D. 418.)

open enough; and yet he declared it catholic: and that not as a private man, but sitting in judicature on a day of hearing in St. Clement's church. And F. Garnier grants, and even proves<sup>c</sup> by good reasons, that this was done in a synod.

XXXIV. St. Austin endeavours to throw a cloak over the nakedness of this pope. For when the Pelagians afterward claimed him as theirs; and said, he must be so, or else he must be owned to have declared contrary to himself; and urged the letters aforesaid; St. Austin pleads<sup>d</sup>:

1. That Zosimus did not in any of his letters deny original sin. True, but he declared that Libellus of Cælestius to be catholic, which did openly deny it to his face.

2. <sup>e</sup>That Zosimus urged Cælestius to assent to the letters of pope Innocent; which letters maintained the true doctrine. This indeed shews that Zosimus did not perceive a plain contradiction when it came in this way.

3. He takes a charitable advantage of those words in the preface of Cælestius, 'That if any mistake have happened to me, &c., it may by your skill be corrected.' And says<sup>f</sup>, 'whereas Cælestius put this [denial of original sin] into his Libellus, only among those things of which he owned himself as yet to doubt, and to desire to be instructed; it was the desire of instruction (in a man of good wit, who, if he had been reformed, might have done a great deal of good) that was approved; and not his false doctrine. And in that sense his Libellus was pronounced catholic; because this is

<sup>c</sup> Dissert. de Synodis in causa Pelagiana.

<sup>d</sup> Ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 3.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. cap. 4.

<sup>f</sup> Cap. 3.

‘ the part of a catholic mind, if it has any opinions  
 ‘ contrary to the truth, not to define them posi- C H A P.  
XIX.  
 ‘ tively, but renounce them when they appear to be (A.D. 418.)  
318.  
 ‘ such.’

We must commend St. Austin’s charity both to Zosimus and Cælestius. But, as Vossius and bishop Ussher observe, he that reads Zosimus’ letters will see that for a long time he defended Cælestius, not as one that was in an error, and was willing to be taught better; but as one that was in no error, but had approved himself to have *absolutam fidem*, (as he in his third and fourth epistle calls it,) a faith absolved from all blame. So that, how favourable an account soever St. Austin gives of this matter; Facundus tells it thus: ‘ Zosimus, contrary to the  
 ‘ sentence of Innocent his predecessor, commended  
 ‘ the faith of Pelagius and of his partner Cælestius,  
 ‘ and blamed the bishops of Africa for counting  
 ‘ them heretics.’

One thing indeed St. Austin there says, which is a good answer to the Pelagians, who accused the church of Rome of changing sides, and prevaricating in their doctrine when Zosimus turned against them; viz. that if Zosimus did ever declare for them and their doctrine, that rather ought to be accounted the prevarication. ‘ For,’ says he<sup>h</sup>, ‘ when  
 ‘ in reverend Innocent’s letters, which say that in-  
 ‘ fants, if they be not baptized in Christ, will remain  
 ‘ in eternal death, the ancient catholic faith is set  
 ‘ forth; he certainly ought to be accounted the  
 ‘ turncoat of the Roman church, that should have

<sup>g</sup> [Defensio Concilii Chalcedonensis, lib. vii. cap. 3.—edit. Lutet. Par. (una cum Optato) 1676.]

<sup>h</sup> Ad Bonifac. lib. ii. cap. 4. §. 8.



CHAP. ‘deviated from that sentence; which by God’s mercy  
XIX. ‘was not done.’

<sup>318.</sup>  
(A.D. 418.) XXXV. Another thing that Pelagius and Cælestius pleaded was, that supposing they were mistaken in their opinion that there is no original sin; yet this ought not to be accounted heresy, nor to deserve excommunication. It was no article of our faith to hold one way or the other; it was but one of the questions of lesser moment.

For Cælestius, says St. Austin<sup>i</sup>, ‘spoke in the  
‘ecclesiastical acts at Carthage after this manner;  
‘“I told you before concerning the derivation of sin,  
‘that I have heard several in the catholic church  
‘deny it, and some I have heard affirm it. It is  
‘a matter of controversy, not of heresy. As for  
‘infants, I always said that they stand in need of  
‘baptism, and that they are to be baptized. What  
‘would he have more?” He spoke this with an  
‘intent to signify, that if he had denied that infants  
‘ought to be baptized, then indeed it might have  
‘been judged heresy: but now that he confesses  
‘that they are to be baptized, though he give not  
‘the true reason of their baptism; yet he supposes  
‘he does not err in a matter of faith, and therefore  
‘is not to be accounted a heretic.

‘Also in the Libellus which he gave in at Rome,  
‘when he had spoke as much as he pleased in  
‘declaring his faith from the Trinity of one Deity  
‘down to the resurrection of the dead, concerning  
‘which matters nobody ever demanded or objected  
‘any thing to him; when he comes to the matter in  
‘hand, he says, “and if any questions have arisen  
‘which many people dispute about; I have not

<sup>i</sup> De Peccato originali, cap. 22, 23, 24.

‘ terminated any thing by definitive authority, as if I  
 ‘ would be the author of any dogma [or article of  
 ‘ faith]; but I offer those things which I have col-  
 ‘ lected from the fountain of the prophets and apo-  
 ‘ stles to be tried by the judgment of your apostle-  
 ‘ ship, &c. “ You see his purpose of this prefacing  
 ‘ is, that if he be found in a mistake, he may seem  
 ‘ not to mistake in the faith, but in some questions  
 ‘ that are beside the faith, &c.—But he is much  
 ‘ out of the way in thinking so. These questions,  
 ‘ which he thinks to be beside the faith, are of a  
 ‘ very different nature from those in which one may  
 ‘ be ignorant, or mistake, without hurt to the faith;  
 ‘ as for example, if a question be put, where the  
 ‘ garden of paradise is, &c.? But in the con-  
 ‘ cerns of those two men, by the first of whom we  
 ‘ are sold under sin, and by the other redeemed  
 ‘ from sin, &c., the Christian faith does properly  
 ‘ consist.” ’

And afterward: ‘ Therefore whosoever does main-  
 ‘ tain that human nature, in any age whatever, does  
 ‘ not stand in need of the second Adam for a physi-  
 ‘ cian, as not being defiled in the first Adam; this  
 ‘ man’s mistake is not in a question in which one  
 ‘ may doubt or err without hurt to the faith, but he  
 ‘ is convicted as an enemy of God’s grace, by the  
 ‘ very rule of faith, by which we are Christians<sup>k</sup>.’

XXXVI. The most material thing to our pur-  
 pose to be observed from these passages of the  
 latter part of this history, is this; how exceedingly  
 the Pelagians were pressed with this argument  
 taken from the baptism of infants; and to how  
 many absurdities they were driven in answering

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. c. 29.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>318.</sup>  
(A.D. 418.)

of it. Sometimes they said they were not baptized for forgiveness, but for something else. Sometimes they owned they were baptized for forgiveness, not that they had any sin, but that the uniformity of the words might be kept; or because they were baptized into the church, where forgiveness was to be had for those that wanted it; or because they were baptized with a sacrament which had the means of forgiveness for any that had sinned, or should sin. And some flew to that, that infants have sin, though not by propagation from a sinful stock; but either before they were born, in a former state, or since they were born, by peevishness, &c. Since these men resolved not to own original sin in infants; how much had it been for their turn to deny that they were to be baptized at all! If they had known of any church or society of Christians, then in being, or that ever had been, that had disowned infant-baptism; their interest would have led them to allege their example, or to plead it in their own behalf. But far from that, Cælestius does own that infants are to be baptized according to the ‘rule of the universal church;’ and Pelagius moreover confesses (the same thing in effect that St. Austin in another place urges) that ‘he never ‘had heard, no not even any impious heretic or ‘sectary, that denied infants’ baptism;’ and that ‘he thought there could not be any one so ignorant ‘as to imagine that infants could enter the kingdom of heaven without it.’ You have their words before, §. 29, 30.

And if there had been any such church of anti-pædobaptists in the world, these two men could not have missed an opportunity of hearing of them,



being so great travellers as they were: for they were born and bred, the one here in Britain, the other in Ireland. They lived the prime of their age (*diutissime*, a very long time, as St. Austin testifies<sup>1</sup>) at Rome, a place to which all the people of the world had then a resort. They were both for some time at Carthage in Africa. Then the one settled at Jerusalem, and the other travelled through all the noted Greek and eastern churches in Europe and Asia. It is impossible there should have been any church that had any singular practice in this matter, but they must have heard of them. So that one may fairly conclude, that there was not at this time, nor in the memory of the men of this time, any Christian society that denied baptism to infants. This cuts off at once all the pretences which some antipædobaptists would raise from certain probabilities, that the Novatians, or Donatists, or the British church of those times, or any other whom Pelagius must needs know, did deny it. I shall however more particularly consider those probabilities at another place<sup>m</sup>.

XXXVII. Besides the passages I have here recited of this controversy, St. Austin wrote a great many more, which I must omit, because the reciting of them all would make a large volume of itself. Several whole books, and many long epistles, he wrote to several men against the doctrine of Pelagius, where he always makes use of the argument taken from the constant use of the church in baptizing infants, to prove it to be the general sense that they have original sin.

<sup>1</sup> Peccato originali, cap. 21.

<sup>m</sup> Part ii. ch. 4.

CHAP. XIX. I will only give the names of some of them, that  
 they that have a mind to read more of this matter,  
 (A.D. 418.) may have recourse to them, if they please.

\* Augustini ad Valerium, de Nuptiis et Concupiscentia.  
 Two books.

\* Ad Bonifacium, contra duas Epistolas Pelagianorum.  
 Four books.

† Enchiridion. One book.

\* De Gratia et libero Arbitrio. One book.

\* De Correptione et Gratia. One book.

\* De Prædestinatione Sanctorum. One book.

\* De Dono Perseverantiæ. One book.

\* Contra Julianum Pelagianum. Six books complete,  
 and other six left imperfect.

\* De Gestis Palæstinis. One book.

† De octo Duleitii Quæstionibus. One book.

§ Comment. in Psalm. li. I was shapen in iniquity, &c.

|| Sermo x. item xiv. de verbis Apostoli. item in Sancti  
 Johannis nativitatem.

¶ Letters to Paulinus, to Optatus, to Sextus, to Cæles-  
 tinus, to Vitalis, to Valentinus, and several others.

All these I pass over, saving that as I have al-  
 ready here and there fetched in some passages of  
 them, I shall at the end of this chapter recite two  
 or three that will shew how the state of this con-  
 troversy stood between St. Austin and Julian, some  
 years after Pelagius had been condemned and given  
 over disputing.

But first, I must give an account of a canon of  
 318. the council of Carthage held anno 418, about this  
 matter: which is one of the eight that have for-

[\* The pieces thus marked are to be found in the 10th vo-  
 lume of the Benedictine edition of St. Austin's works.]

[† Ibid. vol. 6.]

[§ Ibid. vol. 4.]

[|| Ibid. vol. 5.]

[¶ Ibid. vol. 2.]

merly by a vulgar error been attributed to the council of Milevis, held anno 416. Whereas the council of Milevis did only write their sentence in a synodical letter to Innocent; which letter, together with that of the council of Carthage of the same year, I recited before<sup>o</sup>. That was in the year 416. And the next year, 417, there was another meeting of the bishops at Carthage, of which nothing is extant, save that it appears by some passages of St. Austin recited before, §. 33, and some others recited §. 15, that they declared that they could not acquiesce in that judgment which pope Zosimus had passed in favour of Cælestius; of which they advertised Zosimus by their letter.

But the next year after, viz. 418, there was a full assembly at Carthage of the bishops of all the provinces of Africa, 214 in number. Then it was they sent that peremptory letter to Zosimus, which I spake of. And then also they passed eight canons against the Pelagian tenets.

In the second they mention the baptism of infants, condemning two errors about it. One, of those who thought that an infant must upon no account be baptized before he be eight days old. I shewed before<sup>p</sup>, that one Fidus, a bishop near Carthage, had held so 150 years before; and it seems some people were still of that opinion. The other, of those that held that absurd opinion, (which Pelagius and Cælestius had made their last refuge,) that infants are baptized for forgiveness of sins, and yet have no sin. The canon is this;

<sup>o</sup> §. 28.

<sup>p</sup> Chap. vi. §. 1.



CHAP.  
XIX.*Concilii Carthag. anno 418<sup>q</sup>. Canon secundus.*(A.D. 418.)  
<sup>318.</sup><sup>318.</sup>

‘ Item placuit, ut quicumque parvulos recentes ab  
 ‘ uteris matrum baptizandos negat; aut dicit in re-  
 ‘ missionem quidem peccatorum eos baptizari, sed  
 ‘ nihil ex Adam trahere originalis peccati, quod re-  
 ‘ generationis lavacro expietur; (unde fit consequens  
 ‘ ut in eis forma baptismatis in remissionem pecca-  
 ‘ torum non vere sed false intelligatur;) anathema sit.  
 ‘ Quoniam non aliter intelligendum est, quod ait  
 ‘ apostolus, *Per unum hominem peccatum intravit in*  
 ‘ *mundum, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes*  
 ‘ *homines pertransiit, in quo omnes peccaverunt:*  
 ‘ nisi quemadmodum ecclesia catholica ubique dif-  
 ‘ fusa semper intellexit. Propter hanc enim re-  
 ‘ gulam fidei, etiam parvuli qui nihil peccatorum in  
 ‘ semetipsis adhuc committere potuerunt, ideo in  
 ‘ peccatorum remissionem veraciter baptizantur, ut  
 ‘ in eis regeneratione mundetur, quod generatione  
 ‘ traxerunt.’ —————

‘ Also we determine, that whosoever does deny  
 ‘ that infants may be baptized when they come  
 ‘ fresh from their mothers’ womb; or does say, that  
 ‘ they are indeed baptized for forgiveness of sins,  
 ‘ and yet that they derive no original sin from  
 ‘ Adam, (from whence it would follow that the form  
 ‘ of baptism for forgiveness of sins is in them not  
 ‘ true, but false,) let him be anathema. For that  
 ‘ saying of the apostle, *By one man sin entered into*  
 ‘ *the world, and death by sin; and so death passed*  
 ‘ *upon all men, for that [or, in whom] all have*

<sup>q</sup> [Labbe (see Concilia, tom. ii. p. 1538.) assigns these canons to the Milevitan council of 416: and Mansi adheres to that arrangement, tom. iv. p. 325.]

‘ *sinned*, is to be understood in no other sense than  
 ‘ as the catholic church spread over all the world  
 ‘ has always understood it. For by this rule of  
 ‘ faith, even infants, who have not yet been capable  
 ‘ of committing any sin in their own persons, are in  
 ‘ a true sense baptized for forgiveness of sins, that  
 ‘ in them what was derived by generation may be  
 ‘ cleansed by regeneration.’————

CHAP.  
XIX.

(A.D. 318.  
418.)

Here this canon ends in most copies: but in some there is a further clause against such as allow an eternal life in happiness to unbaptized infants, though not in the kingdom of heaven. I shall have occasion to recite that clause, and my opinion about it, in the next chapter. [§. 6.]

The reader will without any admonition perceive the mistake of those men, who speak of this canon as if infant-baptism were established by it as a thing that had been questioned, or was then newly brought into use. It appears with plainness more than enough, that as well the makers of this canon, as they against whom it was made, did both of them look on the thing itself as undoubted; they differed about some of the reasons or effects of it only.

But Grotius did very unkindly give an occasion to vulgar ignorant people to run into this mistake, by that saying of his, recited chap. vi. §. 4, that ‘ there is in the councils no earlier mention of infant-baptism than in the council of Carthage:’ meaning this, or that two years before. Whereas he himself might know well enough, that beside the other passages in authors, and beside the councils I mentioned in chap. xvi. it is mentioned in one of the first councils of which we have any good account

CHAP. since the apostles' time, as I shewed in the aforesaid  
 XIX. sixth chapter.

<sup>318.</sup>  
 (A.D. 418.) XXXVIII. Pelagius and Cælestius being thus  
 condemned, and the bishops that would not sub-  
 scribe to their condemnation being deprived, which  
 were eighteen in number in all the western empire;  
 they made remonstrances, and sent about into the  
 East to several places, but found no countenance.  
 Yet Julian, who had been bishop of Eclanum in  
 Italy, and was the best penman among them, main-  
 330. tained the dispute with St. Austin for some years;  
 each of them writing twelve books one against the  
 other. And St. Austin died while he was writing  
 the last six.

If they had said any thing new in reference to  
 our subject, it had been necessary to relate it: but  
 there being nothing new, I shall only recite two or  
 three passages, to shew that they spoke about in-  
 fant-baptism in the same tenor as before.

After the condemnation, one of the Pelagian party  
 sent a letter to some of the clergy at Rome, hoping  
 to retrieve an interest there. St. Austin thought it  
 was written by Julian, and answers it as his. But  
 Julian disowned it; and St. Austin was content they  
 should ascribe it to which of their sect they pleased.  
 In it they say many things to clear themselves;  
 and, among the rest, this, which is recited by St.  
 320. Austin<sup>r</sup>: 'we do acknowledge that the grace of  
 ' Christ is necessary for all, both grown persons and  
 ' infants; and we renounce all that should say that  
 ' one that is born of parents both baptized ought  
 ' not to be baptized.' And so in the letter which all

<sup>r</sup> Lib. i. ad Bonifac. cap. 22.



the eighteen of them subscribed and sent to the East, 'we own baptism to be necessary for all ages<sup>s</sup>.' CHAP.  
XIX.

To which St. Austin answers, 'What does it signify that they do own baptism to be necessary for all ages, (which the Manichees hold is needless for any age,) so long as they suppose it has no effect in infants for the forgiveness of sin<sup>t</sup>?' (A.D. 418.)<sup>318.</sup>

And speaking to Julian himself, 'As to the question of baptism, about which you complain that there is a great odium raised against you among ignorant people by our lies, it is strange how neatly you come off. You clear yourself of this odium, by owning that "infants are to be baptized; because," you say, "the grace of baptism is not to be altered for the causes [or subjects]<sup>321.</sup> of it; since it dispenses its gifts according to the capacity of those who come to it. And so Christ, who is the Redeemer of his own workmanship, does by a continued bounty increase his benefits towards his image; and those whom he had made good at first, he makes better, by renewing and adopting them<sup>u</sup>."

'Is this all you have to say why there should be no odium raised on you about the baptism of infants? as if any of us had said that you deny that infants ought to be baptized? you do not say that they ought not to be baptized; but according to your great wisdom you say certain strange things. You say, they are baptized in the sacrament of the Saviour; but yet they are not saved from any

<sup>s</sup> Apud August. lib. iii. ad Bonifac. cap. 25.

<sup>t</sup> Lib. iv. ad Bonifac. c. 4.

<sup>u</sup> Lib. iii. advers. Julian. cap. 3.

CHAP. ' thing. They are redeemed by it, you say, and yet  
XIX. ' they are not delivered from any thing by it.'——

<sup>318.</sup>  
(A.D. 418.) And at the end of the chapter, 'They are strange  
' things that you say. They are new things that you  
' say. They are false things that you say. As strange,  
' we are amazed at them; as new, we are shy of  
' them; as false, we confute them.'

And again, chap. 5, having produced a great many proofs that infants have need of the grace of Christ for acquitting them from the guilt of a corrupted nature, he says to Julian,

' If you would come to be of this mind, you  
' would own the grace of God toward infants in its  
' true and natural sense. And you would not be  
' put to those shifts, to say things impious and ab-  
' surd; either that infants are not to be baptized,  
' which perhaps you will hereafter say: or that so  
' great a sacrament is in their case such a mockery,  
' as that they are baptized in a Saviour, but not  
' saved from any thing; that they are washed in  
' the laver of regeneration, but have nothing washed  
' off in it, &c. And all this, because you are afraid  
' to say, they should not be baptized; lest not only  
' the men should spit in your faces, but the women  
' also should throw their sandals at your heads.'

In the sixth book, cap. 3, he puts Julian in mind of his own baptism in infancy; and how ungrateful a thing it is for him to disown the forgiveness of  
286. sin, that was granted to him therein. 'Your good  
' father,' says he, (St. Austin had been acquainted with his father,) 'ran with you, little thinking how  
' ungrateful you would be for that mercy.'

Though St. Austin does over and over again tell the Pelagians, that nobody accused them of denying

baptism to infants; yet it is probable it was him himself they meant to have raised that odium against them among the vulgar. For he speaks here and at other places, as if he thought they had a great mind to deny it, if they could have had the face. He had formerly in a sermon<sup>x</sup>, (which he had preached against them, and which was published,) after many things said to prove that infants have sin, and that it is for that they are baptized, added this; ‘*Nemo ergo vobis susurret doctrinas alienas. Hoc ecclesia semper habuit, semper tenuit: hoc a majorum fide percepit; hoc usque in finem perseveranter custodit: quoniam non est opus sanis medicus, sed ægrotantibus,*’ &c. ‘*Therefore let nobody whisper [or insinuate] any strange doctrines to you. This the church has always had, and ever held; this it has received from the faith of its ancients, and this it keeps constantly to the end, that the whole have no need of a physician, &c. What need then has an infant, if he be not sick?*’ &c.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>318.</sup>  
(A.D. 418.)

But whoever it were that had raised this report, the Pelagians did always carefully and industriously declare their disowning of any such thought or purpose. For, as Pelagius, in his letter before rehearsed, declares that neither he himself, nor any one in the world that he knew or had ever heard of, was ever so ignorant or so impious, as ‘either to say so, or have such a thought:’ so likewise Julian was so enraged against any that insinuated that he or his party denied, or ever meant to deny it; that he sticks not to anathematize all that deny it: for so

<sup>x</sup> Serm. 10. de Verbis Apostoli. [Serm. 176. cap. 2. tom. v. p. 584. ed. Benedict.]



CHAP. are his words, 'We are so far from denying it to be  
 XIX. 'profitable to all ages, that we allot an eternal  
 318.  
 (A.D. 418.) 'anathema to those that say it is not necessary even  
 'for infants y.'

Yet Marius Mercator would needs have it, that their inward sense was against it: only to keep up their credit with Christians they in words and declarations owned it. This he goes about to prove by consequences from their other doctrines; and then says, 'So that it is plain you must think that 'they need not to be baptized: only you impose 'upon us in your words, but in your heart you hold 'the impiety of Jews and heathens z.' This was hard, when they made such protestations to the contrary. He had no other reason than that it would best have fitted with their other doctrines. But Mercator wrote his tract ten years after this of Julian; so that it could not be him that Julian meant.

331. XXXIX. Theodorus, who was at this time bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, was in this question of the mind of the western Pelagians. And Julian, when he was deprived, retired to him. Some will have it that he was elder in this sentiment than Pelagius himself. It might be so, for he was bishop  
 292. from the year 392 to 428. However that be, he  
 328. seems to have concealed this, as well as some other heterodox tenets he had, all his lifetime: they were discovered afterward by some writings he left. He had such singular opinions, especially about the au-

y Apud Augustinum, Operis imperfecti contra Julian. lib. i. cap. 53.

z Subnotationum in Scripta Julian. cap. 8. [responsio 2, p. 53. edit. Garner.]

thority of some books of scripture, that he was, after his death, condemned in some general councils for a heretic in greater points than this. This condemnation of him shews the weakness of the argument of a modern writer<sup>a</sup>, who would prove that the canon of Scripture was not settled in the church at this time, because he rejected some books of it. He shews that he did that, forgetting to tell us that he was therefore condemned as a heretic.

CHAP.  
XIX.

318.  
(A.D. 418.)

As for the book he wrote on the Pelagian side; there is particular reason to conclude that it did not come abroad into the world, till after St. Hierome and St. Austin were dead: because they never take any notice of it, though it be aimed chiefly against them two without mentioning their names.

This book is not now extant: but an abstract of it is given by Photius<sup>b</sup>. If it be lawful to take a quotation at second hand from any author, later than our period, it is from Photius: he was patriarch of Constantinople, anno 858, and the collections of so learned and judicious a man are valued almost as much as if we had the originals.

The title of the book was, ‘Against them that say, men sin by nature and not by will.’ There are particular reflections plain enough upon the two Fathers I mentioned. But one of the opinions he there ascribes to his adversaries as an absurd one, is, ‘That infants, even when they are new born, are not without sin; because our nature being by Adam’s fall become sinful, that sinful nature is derived to all his posterity.’ And one of the argu-

<sup>a</sup> M. Basnage, [in *Histoire de l’Eglise*, livr. viii. ch. 5. §. 6. tom. i. p. 430. ed. Rotterdam, 1699.]

<sup>b</sup> *Bibliotheca. Cod.* 177.

CHAP.  
XIX.

<sup>321.</sup>  
(A.D. 421.)

ments he makes them use to prove it, is this; ‘For what reason are the holy mysteries given to infants? Why are they accounted worthy of baptism [or proper to be baptized,] but because they are full of sin, sin being implanted in their nature? For it is for forgiveness that these things are done to them.’

The answer that he gives is, as Photius observes, the oddest that ever was given. He does not deny that they are baptized for forgiveness. But he says there is one sort of forgiveness which is for sins past: and another to procure a state for us in which we shall no more sin. And that is given, partly in this life, and ‘perfectly (as Photius recites his words) in that restauration which is to be after the resurrection; for the obtaining of which both we, and also new-born infants, are baptized.’ He gave himself a great latitude in the use of words, to call that *forgiveness*.

I mention this man, only to shew that he, as well as the Pelagians of the west, took it for granted that infants are to be baptized, though he thought they have no sin. And even as for that opinion against original sin, (whatever he thought or kept in writing by him,) he found it necessary for him to join with the neighbouring bishops, in a synod held there, to condemn Julian and his opinions; as we understand by Mercator<sup>c</sup>.

XL. After this time, the Pelagian opinions being so universally condemned, none but some very few and very desperate persons did venture to declare for them, or against original sin. But a considerable

<sup>c</sup> Præfat. in Symbolum Theodori [Mopsuesteni, Op. tom. i. p. 95.]



number did still oppose another opinion that St. Austin held about particular prædestination. These were called by their adversaries Semi-pelagians, though they expressly renounced Pelagius as a heretic. And they called their adversaries Prædestinarians. But as to the matter we are treating of, they all agreed, that there is original sin in infants: that all baptized infants dying in infancy are saved: and, that no infant dying without baptism goes to heaven.

C. H A P.  
XIX.

<sup>321.</sup>  
(A. D. 421.)

The difference between them, as to the case of infants that die in infancy, was this: St. Austin and his followers held, that God, by his mere gratuitous pleasure, does ordain that such or such infants shall come to have baptism, and so be saved, and others shall miss of it; without any regard had to the qualifications, which they would have had if they had lived.

But the Semi-pelagians (so called) said, that such infants as God foresaw would have been faithful Christians if they had lived, those he by his providence procured to be baptized: and suffered others to miss of it.

So both agreed, that in both cases, salvation attends baptism.

This appears at large in the works of Prosper, Fulgentius, Cassian, and others of each party; and in the latter works of St. Austin himself, wherein he labours to expose his adversaries' opinion as absurd; since God, who in Scripture is said to judge every one according to what they have done, is brought in by these men, as judging infants by what they did not do, but would have done, if they had lived. And they answered, that this is more

<sup>344.</sup>  
<sup>407.</sup>  
<sup>324.</sup>

CHAP. XIX. reasonable than to judge without any consideration at all.

<sup>321.</sup>  
(A.D. 421.) He objects, that according to their hypothesis, it is to little purpose which is said in the Book of Wisdom<sup>d</sup>, of one that died young, *He was taken away, lest wickedness should alter his understanding, &c.*, if God will judge him according to what he would have done. To which they answer: that that is not canonical scripture: and he does not go about to maintain that it is<sup>e</sup>.

I shall have occasion to produce some of their sayings hereafter<sup>f</sup>, (where I give some account of the opinion of the ancients concerning the future state of infants dying unbaptized) and therefore omit them here.

In this dispute the popes and clergy of Rome were generally zealous for the Prædestinarian side, <sup>323.</sup> as Cælestine, Sixtus, Leo, Hormisdas, &c. The <sup>332.</sup> other side found most abettors in France, especially <sup>340.</sup> about Marseilles. <sup>414.</sup>

---

## CHAP. XX.

*Quotations out of St. Austin and Vincentius Victor.*

THERE were no need of quoting any more out of St. Austin, either of the doctrine that he held, or of the testimony that he gives of the churches' practice in his time or before; were it not that this Vincentius, saying some new things about the case

<sup>d</sup> Ch. iv. 11.

<sup>e</sup> [See the epistle of Hilary to St. Austin, prefixed to Austin's treatise 'de Prædestinatione Sanctorum,' tom. x. p. 519. and that treatise itself, cap. 14. sect. 28. tom. x. p. 534.]

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. ch. 6. §. 4.

of infants that had never been said before, gave occasion to St. Austin also, who answered him, to insist on some new proofs and defences of the catholic doctrine.

CHAP.  
XX.

319.  
(A.D. 419.)

Vincentius seems to have been so inconsiderable a person, that his name would not have been remembered to the next generation, if he had not ventured to write against St. Austin; which now, by the books which that Father vouchsafed to write in answer to him, which are four books, intitled, ‘Of the Soul and its Origin<sup>g</sup>,’ is likely to be spoken of as long as the world lasts.

He was a young layman, remarkable for two things, malapertness in judging and determining of controversial points; and a certain bombast in his style, which St. Austin<sup>h</sup>, out of his wonted civility and condescension, allows to be eloquent; and would make him believe, he might, if he would use his parts well, do God much service.

He was lately come off from the schism of the Donatists, which about this time mouldered away; but being of a restless head, could scarce keep clear of the heresy of the Pelagians, which had been (at the time when St. Austin wrote his first book against him) newly condemned. For so are St. Austin’s words, ‘Secundum Pelagianam hæresim, olim damnabilem, nuperrimeque damnatam<sup>i</sup>.’ ‘According to the Pelagian heresy, which always deserved condemnation, and is just now condemned.’

<sup>g</sup> [De Anima et ejus Origine, contra Vincentium Victorem, libri quatuor; contained in vol. x. of St. Austin’s works, ed. Benedict.]

<sup>h</sup> Lib. i. de Anima et ejus Origine, cap. ii. 3.

<sup>i</sup> Ibid. cap. 19.



CHAP. XX. I take notice of this last circumstance, to set the time of this dispute right : for inasmuch as the year 418 was (as bishop Ussher expresses it) the fatal year for the Pelagian heresy (for it was in that year that the canons of the forementioned great council of Carthage were published, on May the first ; and the imperial edicts on April 30 ; and pope Zosimus' circular letter a little after), this book of St. Austin's must probably have been written the latter end of that year, or the beginning of the next.

<sup>319.</sup>  
(A.D. 419.)

<sup>318.</sup>  
<sup>319.</sup>

I shall by and by make some use of this observation about the year, in explaining a passage which will give some light to this observation, and receive some from it.

§. 2. Vincentius wrote two books, chiefly against that opinion (to which St. Austin inclined) that the soul is by propagation. He owned original sin<sup>k</sup>, which was the most material point in which he differed from the Pelagians. The soul, he said, is a corporeal substance<sup>l</sup>; and so is the spirit (which he took to be different from the soul): on which St. Austin observes, that according to him a man consists of three bodies. But he granted that God is of an incorporeal nature: on which St. Austin says, 'I am glad that in that point however he keeps free from the dotages of Tertullian<sup>m</sup>.' It is to be noted that Tertullian said, that God also is a body, or else he would be nothing at all.

When he came to speak of that question, whether the soul be propagated from the parent to the child, or be by immediate creation; he determined, that

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. cap. 9.

<sup>l</sup> Ibid. cap. 5.

<sup>m</sup> Lib. ii. cap. 5.

it is immediately created: and withal expressed a great contempt of the dulness and ignorance of those that did at all doubt or demur on that question. And he reflected on St. Austin particularly and by name, as one that had confessed his inability to resolve it, because of that objection; how it could consist with God's justice to put a soul that is not derived from Adam, but is created pure, into the body of an infant, where it immediately contracts guilt and defilement.

CHAP.  
XX.  

---

319.  
(A.D. 419.)

We saw before<sup>n</sup> how much St. Austin was puzzled with this objection; and how St. Hierome, being desired by him, had refused to meddle with the solution of it. But now here Vincentius undertakes easily to answer it. But St. Austin shews that unless he could have brought a more skilful answer, he were better have demurred too; and 'were better have confessed his ignorance than 'betrayed his folly.'

The answer he had given was this:

1. First, in respect to such infants as do by God's providence come to have baptism; that 'they being 'by God's præscience prædestinated to eternal life, 'it does them no hurt to continue a little while 'under the guilt of another's sin.' That 'as the 'soul contracts a disease by sinful flesh, so sanctification [viz. that of baptism] is likewise conveyed 'to it by means of the flesh; so that as by it the 'soul lost its merit, [or innocence,] by it also it re-covers its state<sup>o</sup>. For shall we think that, because 'it is the body that is washed in baptism, that '[benefit] which is believed to be given by baptism,

<sup>n</sup> Chap. xv. sect. 6, 7.

<sup>o</sup> Apud Augustin. lib. i. de Anima et ejus Origin. cap. 8.

CHAP. XX. ' is not conveyed to the soul or spirit? Fitly there-  
 fore it does by the flesh recover its former dispo-  
 sition, which by the flesh it had seemed for a  
 while to have lost; that it may begin to be re-  
 generated by that by which it had been defiled<sup>p</sup>:  
 so that though the soul, which could have no sin  
 of its own, did deserve [or had the fate] to be  
 made sinful; yet it did not continue in a state of  
 sin<sup>q</sup>, &c.

Against this answer St. Austin objects, that if we examine it strictly, it makes God first do an ill thing, in bringing an innocent soul into a sinful condition; and then make amends for it a little after by the grace of baptism. 'Avertat autem Deus, et omnino absit, ut dicamus, quando lavacro regenerationis Deus mundat animas parvulorum, tunc eum mala sua corrigere<sup>r</sup>,' &c. 'But God forbid, and far be it from us that we should say, that God, when he cleanses the souls of infants by the washing of regeneration, does then make amends for his own faults,' &c. However, he says this is something; and may, after a fashion, serve for such infants as do come to be baptized. 'De his quidem parvulis—invenit qualitercunque quod diceret<sup>s</sup>,' &c. 'He has found something to answer after a fashion for such infants.'

But the chief difficulty is about those that miss of baptism; of whom we are to see in the next place what Vincentius said.

2. In reference to such as are never baptized, he, in his first book (for he wrote two, as I said) determined thus; 'Habendam dicimus de infantibus

<sup>p</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 7.

<sup>q</sup> Ibid. cap. 8.

<sup>r</sup> Lib. i. cap. 7.

<sup>s</sup> Lib. i. cap. 8.



‘ istiusmodi rationem, qui prædestinati baptismo  
 ‘ vitæ præsentis, antequam renascantur in Christo, CHAP.  
XX.  
 ‘ præveniuntur occiduo, &c.—Ausim dicere istos (A.D. 319.  
419.)  
 ‘ pervenire posse ad originalium indulgentiam pec-  
 ‘ catorum; non tamen ut cœleste inducantur in reg-  
 ‘ num: sicuti latroni confesso quidem, sed non bap-  
 ‘ tizato, Dominus non cœlorum regnum tribuit, sed  
 ‘ paradisum; cum utique jam maneret<sup>t</sup>,’ &c.

‘ We must give some account of those infants,  
 ‘ which being designed to be baptized in their life-  
 ‘ time, are, before they be regenerated in Christ,  
 ‘ prevented with death.—I may venture to say  
 ‘ that they may obtain forgiveness of their original  
 ‘ sins; and yet not be admitted to the kingdom of  
 ‘ heaven. As our Lord granted to the thief, that  
 ‘ owned him and was not baptized, not the kingdom  
 ‘ of heaven but *paradise*; that sentence being in  
 ‘ force; *He that is not born again of water and*  
 ‘ *the Holy Spirit, shall not enter into the kingdom*  
 ‘ *of heaven.* Especially when our Lord says, that  
 ‘ his Father has *many mansions*; by which are  
 ‘ meant the many and different merits [or *rewards*]  
 ‘ of those that shall dwell in them. So that there  
 ‘ both the unbaptized may be admitted to pardon,  
 ‘ and the baptized to the crown which is procured  
 ‘ by grace.

‘ For such infants indeed I give my opinion, that  
 ‘ there be offered for them daily oblations, and con-  
 ‘ tinual sacrifices of holy priests. This I prove to  
 ‘ be fitting to be done, by the example of the Mac-  
 ‘ cabees<sup>u</sup> that fell in the battle<sup>x</sup>,’ &c.

On which determination of his, St. Austin, in the

<sup>t</sup> Apud August. lib. ii. de Anima, &c. cap. 9, 10.

<sup>u</sup> 2 Maccab. xii. 43.

<sup>x</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 11.]

CHAP. next words<sup>y</sup>, makes this remark, ‘Cernis hominem,  
 XX. ‘paradisum atque mansiones quæ sunt apud Pa-  
 (A.D. 419.)<sup>319.</sup> ‘trem, a regno separare cœlorum; ut etiam non  
 ‘baptizatis abundant loca sempiternæ felicitatis,’  
 &c. ‘You see how the man, that he may find  
 ‘places of eternal happiness for such as are not  
 ‘baptized, is fain to separate paradise, and the  
 ‘mansions in God’s house, from the kingdom of  
 ‘heaven.’

And a little after, ‘How can he hope that he  
 ‘himself shall enter into the kingdom of heaven,  
 ‘from which kingdom he excludes the house of the  
 ‘king himself to what distance he pleases?’ And  
 in the third book written to Vincentius himself, he  
 observes, ‘Christ does not say, as you cite his  
 ‘words, *My Father has many mansions*: and if  
 ‘he had said so, they could not be understood to be  
 ‘any where but in his Father’s house<sup>z</sup>. But he  
 ‘says expressly, *In my Father’s house are many*  
 ‘mansions<sup>a</sup>.’

And having a little after observed also that our  
 Lord does not say, *If any one be not born again of*  
*water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the king-*  
*dom of heaven*<sup>b</sup>: but, *he cannot enter into the king-*  
*dom of God*: he then concludes, ‘So I suppose  
 ‘you may by this time understand how wide from  
 ‘truth it is to separate any mansions in the *house*  
 ‘of God from the *kingdom of God*.’

To the instance that Vincentius gives of the  
 thief who went to paradise, though not baptized, as  
 he supposed; St. Austin answers, shewing how ex-  
 traordinary his case was. That he, owning Christ

<sup>y</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 10.]

<sup>z</sup> Cap. 11.

<sup>a</sup> John xiv. 2,

<sup>b</sup> John iii. 3, 5.

at that time when they were putting both Christ and him to death, may well go for a martyr baptized in his own blood; that St. Cyprian reckons him as such; that moreover we are not sure but that he had been baptized, &c., and concludes, ‘*Verum hæc ut volet quisque accipiat; dum tamen de baptismo non præscribatur Salvatoris præcepto, hujus latronis exemplo: et non baptizatis parvulis nemo promittat inter damnationem regnumque cælorum, quietis vel felicitatis cujuslibet atque ubilibet quasi medium locum*’.

CHAP.  
XX.

<sup>319.</sup>  
(A.D. 419.)

‘But of these let every one take which he pleases; always provided that the example of this thief be not made use of for a prescription against our Saviour’s rule concerning baptism: and that no man do promise to unbaptized infants a place of rest and happiness of any sort, or any where, as a kind of middle place between condemnation and the kingdom of heaven.’

III. But Vincentius in his second book went further: for there having reassumed the instance of the thief, and of one Dinocrates<sup>d</sup>, (a boy that died at seven years old; and a sister of his that survived and suffered martyrdom, named Perpetua<sup>e</sup>, had, while she lay in prison, a dream or vision, wherein she saw him in a place of darkness and misery; and afterward, having prayed for his soul, she had another vision or dream, wherein she saw him in a place of happiness. This was recorded in a history that was then 200 years old, and is still extant<sup>f</sup>,) he says of the thief, and of this Dinocrates,

<sup>e</sup> Lib. i. cap. 9.

<sup>d</sup> [Lib. ii. cap. 12.]

<sup>e</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 10.]

<sup>f</sup> *Passio sanctæ Perpetuæ et Felicitatis*. [This was published by Lucas Holstenius, at Paris, in 1664: and is found, with



CHAP. XX.  
 (A.D. 319.<sup>3</sup> 419.) (who he supposes died unbaptized, because born of heathen parents, as the story shews,) that they, for all their want of baptism, obtained paradise: and then adds, ‘ Or if any one do contend that the soul ‘ of the thief, or of Dinocrates, were placed in paradise only for a time, and that they shall have at ‘ the resurrection the reward of the kingdom of ‘ heaven; although that principal sentence, *He that ‘ is not born again of water, &c.* be against this; ‘ yet he shall have my willing assent, if this do ‘ more set forth the effect of the divine mercy and ‘ prescience, and our love of them<sup>g</sup>.’ Shewing hereby, as St. Austin takes it, his opinion to be, that unbaptized infants also may, after staying some time in paradise, attain at the resurrection to the kingdom of heaven.

On which St. Austin says, ‘ Is it possible for any ‘ one to shew greater boldness, rashness, presumption of error in this matter? He remembers our ‘ Lord’s sentence, he repeats it, he sets it down in ‘ his book; he says, “ Although that principal sentence, &c. be against this:” and yet he dares exalt ‘ the neck [or pride] of his own opinion against the ‘ principal sentence.—I entreat you, brother, consider, whoever gives assent to any thing against ‘ the authority of the principal sentence, what sentence he deserves at the hands of the prince.’ And at another place, ‘ You do not consider how much ‘ worse you hold in this matter than Pelagius. For ‘ he, standing in awe of our Lord’s sentence, by

additional remarks, in the *Acta Sanctorum*, for the 7th day of March; and in Ruinart’s ‘ *Acta sincera Martyrum*,’ fol. Amsterdam, 1713, p. 90, &c. See also the next page.]

<sup>g</sup> Apud August. lib. ii. de Anima, &c. cap. 12.

‘ which unbaptized persons are not permitted to CHAP.  
XX.  
 ‘ enter the kingdom of heaven, does not dare send  
 ‘ infants [viz. unbaptized ones] thither, though he (A.D. 319.  
419.)  
 ‘ think them free from all sin<sup>h</sup>.’

But St. Austin does here something stretch Vincentius’ words; for he does not speak this expressly of infants, but of the thief and Dinocrates; and of them but doubtfully.

As to Dinocrates, St. Austin answers<sup>i</sup>,

1. That the book, that tells this story, is no canonical book.

2. That Perpetua, or whosoever wrote it, does not say that he died unbaptized. For that being seven years old, he might have been baptized by the procurement of somebody else, or by his own choice, though his father were a heathen.

And he might have answered further, (as bishop Fell does<sup>k</sup>, to some papists that build the belief of

<sup>h</sup> Lib. iii. cap. 13.

<sup>i</sup> Lib. i. cap. 10.

<sup>k</sup> Notis in *Passionem Perpetuæ*, &c. edit. Oxon. 1680. [p. 14. These notes, which I have had some difficulty in tracing out, occur in an edition of the *Passion of Perpetua*, &c. appended to Lactantius’ treatise ‘*de Mortibus Persecutorum*,’ published by bishop Fell at Oxford, in the year 1680. It is remarkable, that none of the biographical dictionaries, nor Watt in his ‘*Bibliotheca Britannica*,’ nor even Antony à Wood, the diligent inquirer into all these matters, take any notice of such a work having been edited by the bishop: and perhaps it is also curious, considering all the circumstances of the work itself and of its editor, that no copy of it is found in the Bodleian library.

Wood mentions, that Fell ‘published or reprinted every year ‘while he was dean of Christ Church a book, commonly a classical author, against new-year’s tide, to distribute among the ‘students of his house: to which books he either put an epistle, ‘or running notes, or corrections. These,’ says he, ‘I have

CHAP. purgatory, and the duty of praying souls out of it,  
 XX. on this story,) that here is no other evidence of  
 (A.D.<sup>319</sup>.419.) Dinocrates being removed from torment to happiness, than a dream of Perpetua, who, as the bishop shews by some circumstances, was probably a Montanist; and they were a sect that attributed more

‘endeavoured to recover, that the titles might be known and ‘here set down, *but in vain.*’ Athenæ Oxon. vol. iv. c. 198.

In all probability this Lactantius was one of the pieces aluded to. As it is of considerable rarity, I subjoin the title :

‘Lucii Cælii Firmiani Lactantii de Mortibus Persecutorum ‘liber. Accesserunt passionēs SS Perpetuæ et Felicitatis, S. ‘Maximiliani, S. Felicis. Oxonii. e theatro Sheldoniano, anno ‘Dom. 1680.’ 12<sup>o</sup>. pp. 1—108, and 1—56; with a separate preface to each part.

It was not the bishop’s custom to put his name to these annual publications; but it was sufficiently known at the time that he was editor. In the present instance he distinctly announces himself in the preface, which commences with the words, ‘Cum in Operum Cypriani et Lactantii editione *quam* ‘*adornamus*—tardius procedatur,’ &c. He therefore resolves to publish the Lactantius *alone*: and accordingly it does not occur in his edition of Cyprian which appeared two years afterwards, nor is there any notice of it in the preface to that Father’s works.

The supplementary pieces of Perpetua, &c. are not reprinted in the *second* Oxford Lactantius, edited by *Sparke* in 1684, 8vo. nor in that published, with the collected notes of various editors, by Paulus Bauldri at Utrecht, in 1692; but in the preface to this last there is honourable mention of Fell’s edition; and although not *named*, he was certainly *known* to Bauldri, as its author. Walchius likewise, in his ‘Bibliotheca patristica,’ p. 149, cites this edition as appearing ‘cum brevibus scholiis ‘Joann. Felli.’ Oxoniæ, 1680. 12<sup>o</sup>.

I may add, that the Passion of Perpetua is corrected by the bishop from a manuscript in the Salisbury library, the various readings of which, together with his own terse notes, are appended to every page.]



to their dreams and revelations than to the Scrip-  
 ture. Nor does any author before Vincentius quote  
 this book, but Tertullian, who was himself a Mon-  
 tanist.

CHAP.  
 XX.  
 (A.D. 319.  
 419.)

St. Austin shews also that Vincentius is the first that ever advised the prayers of the church to be used for any that had died unbaptized, or for any but church members. They had then, and so they had in Tertullian's and Cyprian's time<sup>1</sup>, a custom of commemorating, at the receiving of the eucharist, the names of the faithful deceased, and of making some general prayers for them, such as, 'God rest ' their souls, and grant them a happy resurrection:' but nothing like those prayers which the papists make for souls supposed to be in purgatory; nor did they use them for any but baptized and faithful Christians. Therefore, whereas Vincentius advises these prayers to be used as an after remedy for such infants as had died without being partakers of baptism; St. Austin on this account says, 'Do not ' believe, nor say, nor teach, that the sacrifice of ' Christians is to be offered for such as die unbap- ' tized, if you will be a catholic. For neither do ' you shew that that sacrifice of the Jews which you ' mention out of the books of the Maccabees was ' offered for such as died uncircumcised. In which ' your opinion so new, and set up against the au- ' thority of the whole church<sup>m</sup>,' &c.

IV. I have recited these passages the larger, and in Vincentius' own words, because there has been

<sup>1</sup> Tertull. de Monogam. 'pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium,' &c. [cap. 10.]

<sup>m</sup> De Anima, &c. lib. 3. cap. 12.

CHAP. lately a hot dispute between Colonel Danvers<sup>n</sup>, an  
 XX.  
 ————— antipædobaptist, on one side; and Mr. Baxter and  
 (A.D.<sup>319</sup>. 419.) Mr. Wills on the other; whether this Vincentius  
 denied infant-baptism. You may judge by what  
 I have rehearsed of Vincentius' own words, that the  
 Colonel undertook a hard task. Yet he maintained  
 his post a great while, referring the reader for  
 1309. proof to Austin and Tho. Waldensis<sup>o</sup>, which latter

<sup>n</sup> [For some notice of Mr. Danvers, see pp. 133, 257. above.  
 For the particulars of this dispute, and the opinions maintained  
 by the several parties here mentioned, the reader is referred to  
 the following pieces :

1. R. Baxter: (besides his other controversial tracts against  
 Tombes and Bedford) 'Plain Scripture proof of Infants' Church-  
 'membership and Baptism.' 4to. 1651: again, 1656.

——'More proofs of Infants' Church-membership, and con-  
 'sequently their right to baptism.' 8vo. 1675.

[See particularly this latter treatise, written expressly against  
 Tombes and Danvers, part ii. ch. 4. §. 18.]

2. H. Danvers; 'A Treatise of Baptism, wherein that of  
 'Believers, and that of Infants, is examined by the Scriptures.  
 'With the history of Christianity amongst the ancient Britains  
 'and Waldensians.' 8vo. 1674.

——'Innocency and Truth vindicated: or a sober Reply to  
 'Mr. Wills' Answer to a late Treatise of Baptism.' 8vo. 1675.

——'Second Reply,' &c. 8vo. 1676.

3. Obed Wills: 'Infant-Baptism asserted and vindicated by  
 'Scripture and antiquity, in Answer to a Treatise of Baptism  
 'lately published by Mr. Henry Danvers.' 8vo. 1674.

——'Vindiciæ Vindiciarum; or a Vindication of the said  
 'Treatise,' &c. also 'An Appeal to the Baptists against Mr. Dan-  
 'vers for his strange Forgeries,' &c. 8vo. 1675.

——'Censura Censuræ; or a just Censure of the unjust Sen-  
 'tence of the Baptists upon an Appeal made against Mr. H.  
 'Danvers.' 8vo. 1676.]

[<sup>o</sup> See 'Thomæ Waldensis, Anglici Carmelitæ, doctrinale Anti-  
 quitatum Fidei Ecclesiæ Catholicæ,' 3 tom. fol. Venetiis, 1571.  
 Especially the treatise 'De Sacramento Baptismi,' ch. 99. tom. ii.  
 p. 164.]

lived but about 300 years ago. But his antagonists, CHAP.  
XX.  
 searching and reciting the places to which he had referred, made it plain that neither of them had (A.D. 419.)<sup>319.</sup>  
 said any other thing of Vincentius' opinions than what is to the same purpose with that which I have here recited from himself. This had been enough to damp the courage of an ordinary man. But he, being thus home charged, and not used to yield, said at last, 'He denied it, as the denial of 'infant-baptism went in those days,' viz. 'that 'children might be saved without it <sup>p</sup>.' The sense of which words, if they have any, is this: that nobody in those days denied infant-baptism any otherwise than by saying that children might be saved without it. Which is to yield the whole matter in dispute about the practice of those times, for fear of seeming to yield in one particular.

The truth of the matter is; that if we except Tertullian, (whose words I shewed before to be ambiguous and inconsistent,) this Vincentius is the first man upon record that ever said that children might be saved without baptism; if by being saved we mean going to heaven: for that many before him thought they would be in a state without punishment, I have shewed before.

V. Vincentius does not speak positively neither; and that which he did say, he, some time after he had received these books of St. Austin wrote against him, recanted. This St. Austin lets us know in the Review of his own works, written seven years after this time <sup>q</sup>. For there, speaking of these books which

<sup>p</sup> Second Reply, p. 37.

<sup>q</sup> Retractat. lib. ii. cap. 56. [Op. tom. 1.]



CHAP. he had wrote in answer to Vincentius, he adds;  
 XX.  
 (A.D.<sup>319</sup>. 419.) ‘ Which young man I treated with all the mildness  
 ‘ possible, as one that was not hastily to be detest-  
 ‘ ed; but to be as yet instructed; and I received  
 ‘ from him writings in answer, containing his re-  
 ‘ cantation.’

VI. Here is a proper place to say something of that clause, which I said even now<sup>r</sup> is found in some copies of the canons of the council of Carthage, anno 418, annexed as a part of the second canon. It is this:

‘ Item placuit, ut si quis dicit ideo dixisse Do-  
 ‘ minum, *In domo Patris mei mansiones multæ sunt*,  
 ‘ ut intelligatur, quia in regno cœlorum erit aliquis  
 ‘ medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant  
 ‘ parvuli, qui sine baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt;  
 ‘ sine quo in regno [*l. regnum*] cœlorum, quod est  
 ‘ vita æterna, intrare non possunt, anathema sit.’

‘ Also it has seemed good to us, that if any one  
 ‘ affirm that our Lord did therefore say, *In my*  
 ‘ *Father’s house are many mansions*; that it should  
 ‘ be meant, that there will be in the kingdom of  
 ‘ heaven any middle place, or any place any where,  
 ‘ in which infants may live in blessedness that have  
 ‘ died without baptism; without which they cannot  
 ‘ enter into the kingdom of heaven, (which is all  
 ‘ one as eternal life,) he should be anathema.’

Most part of the copies have not, as I said before, this clause. But it is found in several. Mr. Du Pin mentions an old MS. that has it; and says that Photius cites it; [Cod. 53.] and that the Codex published by Quesnellus has it. Cardinal Noris quotes it, but thinks it spurious. And those antipædobap-

<sup>r</sup> Ch. xix. §. 37.

tists that examined Wills' appeal against Danvers, say that they find it in the *Collectio Regia*, tom. iv. p. 559<sup>s</sup>. The critics have not, as I know of, given any account of this difference in the copies; of which I will here give my conjecture.

I believe the canon, as it was first enacted and published (which was, as I shewed before, in the council in May 418) had not this clause. But F. Garnier<sup>t</sup> and bishop Ussher before him<sup>u</sup> have plainly shewn that there was in June the next year, viz. 419, another council of the bishops of all the provinces of Africa, in which 'the canons of the former council were read over and confirmed;' and also (as bishop Ussher has it) 'some peculiar matter against the Pelagian tenets enacted.' He does not give any guess what that peculiar matter should be: but he proves that there was some such thing, partly from Prosper, and partly from this following

<sup>s</sup> [It is indeed recited in the above place, but in smaller letters than the rest, with this introduction: 'Quidam pervetustus codex hoc loco hujusmodi caput insertum habebat: Item placuit,' &c. Labbe's edition does not notice this clause: but in that of Mansi, tom. iv. p. 504, we again find it, printed in smaller type, headed, 'Nota ex Surio et Binio,' (editors of the Councils in 1567 and 1606) with a remark that it was found in that old MS. of canons which was published by Quesnel.—This may be seen in the second volume of Pope Leo I.'s works by that editor: where, at cap. xiii. sect. 3. p. 75, the clause appears, as among canons passed at a full council holden at Carthage, against Pelagius and Cælestius, in the year 418. See too Quesnellus' defence of the canon, in his 'Dissertatio xiii. de Conciliis Africanis,' ibid. tom. ii. p. 699.]

<sup>t</sup> Dissert. de Synodis in Causa Pelagiana [Diss. 2. cap. 16. apud Mercatoris Op. tom. i. p. 218.]

<sup>u</sup> Ecclesiæ Brit. Antiquit. cap. 10. prope finem.

CHAP. passage of St. Austin in his letter to Valentinus;  
 XX.  
 (A.D.<sup>319</sup>.<sub>419</sub>.) ‘What was written to pope Zosimus from the Afri-  
 ‘can council; and his letter to the bishops of all  
 ‘the world; and what we did, in the following  
 ‘plenary council of all Africa, enact in short against  
 ‘that error<sup>x</sup>.’ That plenary council, which he calls  
 the *following one*, and places after Zosimus’ letter,  
 must have been in 419; since I shewed before, that  
 that letter was after the council in 418.

I also shewed before, at §. 1, that this new fancy  
 of Vincentius was published and canvassed in the  
 time that passed between those two councils, viz. in  
 the latter end of the year 418, or in the beginning  
 of the year 419. And it was published in Mauri-  
 tania Cæsariensis, one of the African provinces: for  
 there Vincentius lived, as St. Austin tells us<sup>y</sup>. And  
 it had some followers; for he speaks of one Peter,  
 a presbyter, that among others embraced it.

I believe then, that the canon of 418 had only  
 so much as is in the ordinary copies; but that the  
 bishops, meeting in 419, and understanding that  
 this opinion had been, since their last meeting,  
 vented in one of their provinces, to support by a  
 new salvo the Pelagian hypothesis; they then added  
 to the second canon, which spoke of the case of  
 infants, this clause.

My chief reason is, because this addition recites  
 the very words of Vincentius, and does condemn  
 them in almost the same words which St. Austin  
 had used in the confutation of them: as will appear  
 to any one that will turn back to §. 2, 3. And the

<sup>x</sup> Epist. 47. [215. ed. Benedict. sect. 2. where see the editor’s  
 note.]

<sup>y</sup> Retractat. lib. ii. cap. 56.



fancy was so new and uncouth, that no council could have thought of it, but on such a particular occasion.

CHAP.  
XX.  

---

319.  
(A.D. 419.)

And I believe the reason why most copies of that council do now want this clause is,

1. Because the canon having been first published without it, many copies went abroad before that appendix was added. And,

2. Because the modern church of Rome has set up an hypothesis so like this of Vincentius, and their *limbus infantum* does so nearly resemble his *feigned paradise*, being as that was, a kind of *middle place*; that those of that church, who had the transcribing of copies, did not like well of an anathema denounced against such an opinion.

---

## CHAP. XXI.

*Irenæus, Epiphanius, Philastrius, St. Austin, and Theodoret, who wrote each of them catalogues of all the sects and sorts of Christians that they knew or had ever heard of, do none of them mention any that denied infant-baptism, except those who denied all baptism.*

§. I. THE Christians have always been of two sorts, viz. catholics, who, though they inhabited several countries, yet did all own communion one with another, and so made one catholic body, or church; and sectaries, or heretics, who renounced the catholic body aforesaid, and separated into several parties on account of some tenets, opinions, or practices in religion, which they held different from the catholic church; or sometimes merely on account of some quarrel with the governors thereof. The church of Christ never was, nor ever in this

67—330.  
(A. D.  
167—430.)

CHAP. world will be, so happy as to be without such sects  
 XXI. and divisions. But woe be to the men by whom  
 67—330. they come.  
 (A. D.

167—430.) The quotations hitherto produced do concern the practice of the catholics in this matter of infant-baptism; saving that here and there by the by there has been mention made of the tenets of some of the heretics or schismatics. As of the Donatists, chap. ix. §. 1; chap. xv. sect. 4. §. 4; chap. xvi. §. 1, 2: and of the Arians, chap. xii. §. 9, 10: and of the Pelagians, chap. xix. *per totum*: of all whom it appears that they practised infant-baptism, as the catholics did; and that without any difference of opinion concerning the use or effect of it; save that the Pelagians held that it was not for the cure of original sin, but for other purposes. Also we saw in the said chap. xix. the several declarations of St. Austin, at §. 17, pleading that he had never heard, and of Pelagius at §. 30, granting that he also had never heard, of any sect or sort of Christians that denied infant-baptism. And that which they two do say there in general, I find to be agreeable to the account that is given by all the rest that write histories of the several sects in particular, viz. that among all that vast number of sects, and their several opinions which they recite, they mention none that denied baptism to infants.

They do indeed each of them mention some sects that used no baptism at all; of which sects I do give a catalogue in the second part of this work<sup>z</sup>. St. Austin observes they were all of them such as disowned also the scripture, or a great part thereof. But my meaning is, that of all the sects that owned

<sup>z</sup> Chap. v.

any water-baptism at all, they mention none that denied it to infants.

CHAP.  
XXI.

Now since they do all of them make it their business to rehearse all the tenets, opinions, and usages, which these men held different from the catholic party, and yet do mention no difference in this particular; one may conclude that they all of them practised in this particular as the catholics did. If the catholics had not baptized infants, and the sectaries had; it would have been noted. And if the catholics did baptize them, and the sects had not; that also would have been noted. For they recite all that each sect had singular. And they mention differences of much less moment than this would have been. Now what evidence there is of the practice of the catholics in this matter, must be left to be judged by him that has read the foregoing chapters: for the authors cited in them were all members of the catholic church, save that Tertullian afterward revolted from it, and Pelagius with his followers were excommunicated out of it.

67—330.  
(A. D.  
167—430.)

II. The first treatise concerning sects or heresies, that is extant, was written by Irenæus. He, about twenty years after St. John's death, was a hearer of Polycarp (St. John's disciple and acquaintance) at Smyrna; and about forty-seven years after that, was made bishop of Lyons in France: so that, having lived and conversed in such distant countries, and with such men, he had an opportunity of knowing what sects there were or had been. He wrote this tract about the year after the apostle's death 76 or 77, as I shewed before in chap. iii. §. 6. He mentions the sects that arose in the time of the apostles,



CHAP. and those that had sprung up in the seventy-six  
XXI.  
\_\_\_\_\_ years that had passed since their death.

<sup>67—330.</sup>  
(A. D. They were all of them but a few in comparison  
<sup>167—430.</sup>) of the number that arose afterward: but a great many considering the time that had then passed. He takes most pains in refuting the Valentinians; who, it seems, were most numerous at that time and place. But he says himself that his purpose was to rehearse all that were, or had been; which was easy to do for so short a space.

After much discourse against the Valentinians, he goes to prove that they derived their opinions, not from Christ or his apostles; but from the former heretics which had in the apostles' time set themselves against the apostles. These are his words:

‘ Since then that there is manifold evidence  
‘ against all the sects; and that my purpose is to  
‘ confute each of them according to their several  
‘ tenets; I think it proper in the first place to  
‘ recount from what fountain and original they  
‘ sprung<sup>a</sup>.’

Then he declares how Simon the magician, mentioned by St. Luke<sup>b</sup>, was the first, who, after he was rejected by the apostles, set up a sect; and taught that this world was made, not by the good and supreme God, but by inferior and evil powers: and proceeds in the following chapters to shew that this impious tenet made a main part in the doctrine, not only of the Valentinians, against whom he was principally engaged; but also of most of those elder

<sup>a</sup> Lib. i. cap. 19. [cap. 22. sect. 2. edit. Benedict.]

<sup>b</sup> Acts viii. 9.

ones that had followed Simon's example in setting up sects. For the same thing was taught by Menander, Saturninus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Cerdo, and Marcion, as well as by Valentinus. And so it was, after Irenæus' time, by Manes and the Manichees.

CHAP.  
XXI.  
67—330.  
(A.D.  
167—430.)

Of these heretics mentioned by him, the first two, Simon and Menander, do seem to have endeavoured to obliterate the memory of Jesus Christ. For each of them pretended himself to be *that great power of God*<sup>c</sup> [viz. of the supreme God] that was to redeem men from the malice and tyranny of that angel, or inferior god, that made the world, and gave the law.

The two next, Saturninus and Basilides, owned Jesus Christ that came in Judæa: but they owned only his divine nature<sup>d</sup>. For they said he was not really a man, nor did really die, but only in appearance.

The two next, Carpocrates and Cerinthus<sup>e</sup>, owned him to be a man and a saviour; but not to be God, nor to have had any being before his human birth. Only they said, a divine power from the Supreme God came down at a certain time upon him, and dwelt in him, which enabled him to do what he did. This last opinion is now going to be revived.

All these three branches of heresy arose while St. John was alive: and so did the Ebionites and Nicolaitans, which he mentions likewise<sup>f</sup>. These did not join in the foresaid blasphemy against the Creator of the world. But had other abominable

<sup>c</sup> Irenæus, lib. i. cap. 20, 21. [cap. 23.]      <sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 22, 23. [cap. 24.]      <sup>e</sup> Ibid. cap. 24, 25. [cap. 265, 2.]      <sup>f</sup> Ibid. cap. 26, 27. [cap. 26.]

CHAP.  
XXI.

---

In the apo-  
stles' time.

tenets. The Nicolaitans, chiefly in reference to practice: allowing fornication, &c. And the Ebionites in point of faith: disbelieving the divinity of our Saviour, (as the Cerinthians and Carpocratians,) and renouncing and railing at the apostle Paul, and all his writings; which do now make one half, and at that time made the much greatest part of the scriptures of the New Testament: for St. John had not written when they set up their sect. This would make one stand amazed at the impiety of those men nowadays, that calling themselves Christians, would yet persuade us that these Ebionites were the true Christians of those times: that they were the orthodox; and those whom we call catholics, were erroneous. The tendency of such a tenet is to persuade us, together with the doctrine of Christ's divinity, to renounce also half the books of the New Testament. As St. John lived to see all these heresies vented; so one may perceive that he at several places of his writings opposed himself to such opinions.

Of sects that had arisen after the death of the apostles, he mentions<sup>g</sup> the Encratites, the Caians, the sects of Cerdo, of Marcion, and of Valentinus. The last four of these were an offspring of those first mentioned, (who were by a general name called Gnostics,) and did all agree with them in the point afore mentioned, that the Maker of heaven and earth is not the supreme God; but that there is another far above him: and that it was that upper one that sent the Saviour.

It was in opposition to this sort of heretics, that the catholic church found it necessary to insert that

<sup>g</sup> Iren. lib. i. cap. 28, 29, 30, 35. [cap. 27, 28, 31.]



clause, THE MAKER OF HEAVEN AND EARTH, CHAP. XXI.  
 into the first article of the creed. For the most  
 ancient creeds had no more in that article than, ‘I In the apo-  
 stles’ time.  
 ‘believe in God the Father Almighty.’ The eastern  
 church, where those heresies were most rife, insert-  
 ed it first; and the Latins from them. The Latins  
 had it not in their creed at the year 400. Without  
 that clause, the Manichees, Gnostics, &c., would say,  
 they believed in God the Father Almighty; but  
 would mean a quite different God from him whom  
 the Christians owned: who always meant the Cre-  
 ator of the world, and author of the Old Testament,  
 to be the same with the Father of our Lord Jesus  
 Christ.

It pleased God by his providence so to order it;  
 that though some heresies were very ancient, yet  
 they are all so absurd, that they can tempt no man  
 of ordinary sincerity that reads the scriptures.

The points concerning baptism, in which Irenæus  
 notes any of the said sects to have held any thing  
 singular, are these:

Menander promised<sup>h</sup> that all that would be bap-  
 tized with his baptism, [or baptism in his name,]  
 should presently have a resurrection; and after that  
 should never die nor grow old, but be immortal.  
 Whereupon Tertullian, about 100 years after Me-  
 nander’s death, challenges<sup>i</sup> that sect to produce any  
 of their fellows that had been baptized by Menander  
 himself, that was yet alive.

The Carpocratians ear-marked their proselytes.  
 And that, as I understand Irenæus<sup>k</sup>, went for their  
 baptism. ‘They burned a whole in the hinder part

<sup>h</sup> Iren. lib. i. cap. 21. [cap. 23.]

<sup>i</sup> De Anima, cap. 50.

<sup>k</sup> Lib. i. cap. 24. [cap. 25.]

CHAP.  
XXI.

In the apo-  
stles' time.

‘ of the lap of the right ear.’ Here let me add a few of the next words, though not to this purpose. ‘ They call themselves Gnostics, [i. e. the men of knowledge ;] they use also certain images, some painted, and some carved ; and say, they are pictures of Christ drawn by Pilate, while Jesus lived among men. On these they put garlands, and set them up together with the images of the philosophers of the world, as Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle, &c. And they use all such ceremonies to them as the heathen do.’ These men, and some people at Paneas, mentioned by Eusebius<sup>1</sup> to have had the like heathenish fancy, as he calls it, are the ‘ first authors of the worship of Christ by an image that are any where mentioned.’ Epiphanius also mentions the ear-marks used by the Carpocratians, Hær. 27.

The Valentinians had several under-sects, of which Irenæus speaks particularly. And for their baptism, he says<sup>m</sup> they had as many sorts of it as there were teachers among them ; but all contrary to the true. Some instead of baptism dressed up a marriage-bed, and with certain profane words acted a marriage of the person to Christ. Others put the person into the water indeed, but instead of the Christian form of baptism used a strange and uncouth one, which I have occasion to repeat at another place<sup>n</sup>, and anointed the baptized person with balsam. ‘ There are some of them,’ says Irenæus, ‘ who think it needless to bring the person to the water at all ; but mixing oil and water together they pour it on his head, [by which words of his,

<sup>1</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. vii. cap. 18.

<sup>m</sup> Lib. i. cap. 18. [cap. 21.]

<sup>n</sup> Part ii. chap. v. §. 1.

‘ and by a thousand other instances it appears that  
 ‘ the catholics did ordinarily put the whole body in  
 ‘ the water,] and they use certain words not much  
 ‘ different from those I mentioned before; and they  
 ‘ will have this to be redemption, [or baptism,] and  
 ‘ these also use balsam.’ Others of them used no  
 water at all, nor other external ceremonies; but  
 said: ‘ spiritual baptism, which consists in the  
 ‘ knowledge of the unspeakable Majesty, is all in  
 ‘ all.’

CHAP.  
XXI.

In the apo-  
stles' time.

III. Some of them did pour oil and water on the heads of people newly dead, with such words and imprecations as he had before mentioned; and they told the dead man's soul what it should say, if in its way to the supreme heaven, it should meet with any of the principalities or powers that belong to him that made this world. The soul was to say, ‘ that  
 ‘ it was better than the power that made them.’ And a great deal more such blasphemous stuff.

Irenæus excuses himself from descending to more particularities: for that they inventing every day new ways and opinions, it was endless to describe them all.

As to the Cerinthians and Marcionists, he is very short, and says nothing about their baptism. But Epiphanius<sup>o</sup> speaks of a tradition that the Cerinthians did use to baptize some living person in the stead of any friend of theirs that had happened to die unbaptized: and that it was in relation to such a practice that the apostle says<sup>p</sup>, *If there be no resurrection of the dead, why are they then baptized for the dead?* And St. Chrysostom, in his explication of that text, says, that the Marcionists did the same.

<sup>o</sup> Hær. 28. [cap. 6. tom. i. p. 114.]

<sup>p</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 29.



CHAP. XXI. And Tertullian in his fifth book against Marcion<sup>q</sup>, speaks of that custom, and the apostle's mentioning of it; but shews that his mentioning of it is no evidence that he approved it. The Comments ascribed to St. Ambrose do also so interpret the place.

In the apostles' time.

There are two objections against that interpretation.

1. One is, that the Marcionists for certain, and probably the Cerinthians, were not in being when that apostle wrote. Cerinthus had a party before St. John's death; but this epistle of St. Paul was a long time before that.

Therefore Scaliger and others think that some zealous, but ignorant people, among the catholics had upon a sense of the necessity of baptism begun this custom in St. Paul's time: and that in the catholic church it was quickly left off; but that it was continued afterward among the Cerinthians and Marcionists.

2. The other is, that St. Paul would not probably draw an argument for the resurrection of the dead from so weak a topic as the practice either of abominable heretics or mistaken Christians.

But these men do not seem to have minded that St. Paul does sometimes take in the suffrages even of heathen men in his arguings. He might reasonably enough propose to himself to shame those among the Christians at Corinth that did not believe the resurrection, by instancing in the general assent that was given to that article among all Christians: and even among those who, how much soever they might be mistaken in thinking that that

vicarious baptism would avail the dead, yet did CHAP. XXI. plainly shew that they fully believed the resurrec-  
tion of the dead, when they practised this sort of In the apostles' time. baptism for them.

This interpretation is certainly the most obvious. And it is something confirmed by the ill success of those that have attempted any other. That ‘baptized for the dead’ should stand instead of ‘baptized for their bodies<sup>r</sup>.’ Or, that ‘for the dead,’ should be construed, ‘for the state of the dead<sup>s</sup>,’ or, ‘for their dead Adam<sup>t</sup>,’ or, ‘why are they baptized for the dead?’ i. e. why are persons ready to die desirous of baptism ‘that it may be well with them after they are dead<sup>u</sup>?’ Or, that *ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν* should be translated, ‘over the dead,’ i. e. why do people choose to receive their baptism at the tombs of dead martyrs<sup>x</sup>? Or, ‘that baptized for the dead,’ should mean nothing but ‘washed after the touch of a dead body<sup>y</sup>.’ These are the essays of learned men. But the more one observes the apostle’s phrase, the less probable they appear.

The latest that has been given, is, I think, the worst; ‘why are they baptized for the dead?’ that is, ‘why are new Christians baptized every day in the room of those that die<sup>z</sup>?’ For that fits neither the phrase nor the scope of the place.

<sup>r</sup> Tertullian. contra Marcion. lib. v. cap. 10.

<sup>s</sup> Chrysost. in loc. [Homil. 40. Op. tom. x. p. 378.]

<sup>t</sup> Vossius de Baptismo, Disp. 12. cap. 2.

<sup>u</sup> Epiphani. Hær. 28,—cap. 6.

<sup>x</sup> Prudent. Hymn. 8. [De loco in quo martyres passi sunt, nunc baptisterium dicitur.]

<sup>y</sup> Vasquez in tertiam part. Thomæ Aquin. Disp. 157.

<sup>z</sup> Mr. Le Clerc. Annot. in loc.

CHAP.  
XXI.In the apo-  
stles' time.

Ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν for ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν<sup>a</sup>  
 ‘upon the faith of the resurrection of the dead,’  
 would fit the sense very well: but it is a great  
 stretch of the words. ‘Baptized for the dead, i. e.  
 ‘buried under water for dead,’ or, as if they were  
 dead<sup>b</sup>, is a mere Anglicism; that would never in  
 Greek have been expressed ὑπὲρ νεκρῶν, but ὡσεὶ  
 νεκροί.

St. Chrysostom's objection<sup>c</sup> against this sense of  
 the place, that St. Paul should refer to such a custom  
 among some Christians, is this; ‘If Paul meant so,  
 ‘to what purpose is the threatening of God against  
 ‘one that is not baptized? For if this shift [viz. of  
 ‘a living person to be baptized for one that is dead]  
 ‘be admitted, none will ever miss of baptism; or, if  
 ‘he do, it will be the fault of those that survive, and  
 ‘not of the dead person.’ But St. Chrysostom does  
 not seem to have considered, that, (as Tertullian  
 says,) the apostle might mention this custom without  
 approving it. Though a mistaken practice, yet it  
 shewed still the faith of the resurrection.

The Marcionists had also several other singular  
 opinions about baptism. They would baptize no  
 married person till he did divorce his wife: for they  
 said that marriage and all the works thereof were  
 wicked things, and were ordered by that evil god or  
 angel that gave the law, and made mankind. Hence  
 Tertullian jeers them<sup>d</sup>, saying, that they ‘reserved  
 ‘a man's baptism till he was divorced or dead.’

What Irenæus here says of one sort of the Valen-  
 tinians, that they baptized some persons after they

<sup>a</sup> Hammond. in loc.<sup>b</sup> Sir Norton Knatchbull.<sup>c</sup> In loc. [Homil. 40. §. 1.]<sup>d</sup> Contra Marcionem, lib. iv. cap. 11.



were dead, Philastrius says<sup>e</sup>, was the common tenet of the Montanists or Cataphryges. ‘Hi mortuos  
‘baptizant.’ These baptize people after they are  
dead. There were also here and there some in the catholic church, who through a mistaken zeal and compassion to persons that died unbaptized, would sometimes do the same. For there is a canon in the third council of Carthage against that practice. That council allows sick people to be baptized though they be speechless, if there be good evidence of their fitness and desire of it<sup>f</sup>. But yet they say<sup>g</sup>, ‘Let not any priests be so ignorant as to think that ‘dead persons may be baptized.’

CHAP.  
XXI.

In the apostles’ time.

Inasmuch as Irenæus, among all these observations, says nothing *pro* or *contra* about baptizing infants among the heretics; it may, as I said, be concluded that they had nothing singular in that point, but practised as the catholics did. And for the catholics, I produced before<sup>h</sup> the saying of Irenæus himself, where he speaks of infants being, as well as grown persons, the ordinary subject of regeneration. And that by *regenerated*, he and all the ancients did understand *baptized*, whatever pains might be necessary to shew it then in that chapter, I suppose there is none needful now: because the reader has since that seen that all the authors do speak in that language.

IV. The other four, Epiphanius, Philastrius, From 265 to 350.

<sup>e</sup> Hæres. Cataphrygum. [cap. 49. p. 103. edit. Fabricii, 120. 1721. Fabricius refers to Dr. Wall’s notice of this passage, in his note.]

<sup>f</sup> [Concil. Carth. iii. anno Christi 397. apud Labb. ii. p. 1167, &c.] Canon 34.

<sup>g</sup> Canon 6.

<sup>h</sup> Chap. iii. §. 2.

CHAP. Austin, and Theodoret, were all living at one time ;  
 XXI.  
 only Epiphanius was the eldest, and Theodoret the  
 265—350.  
 (A. D.) youngest. I shall not with these take the same  
 365—450.) pains as I did with Irenæus, of setting down all the  
 customs or tenets that they recount the several  
 sects to have held different from the catholics, in the  
 matter of baptism : it would be too voluminous. It  
 is sufficient that they do none of them mention any  
 thing concerning infant-baptism either as practised,  
 or as not practised by any of the sectaries, (a plain  
 proof that they held nothing in that point different  
 from the ordinary practice of the church,) save that  
 St. Austin notes of the Pelagians (which is in his  
 account the eighty-seventh and last heresy that had  
 risen) that though they agreed with the church that  
 infants are to be baptized, yet they held a different  
 opinion concerning the ground or reason of their  
 baptism. His words are these<sup>i</sup>; ‘ Parvulos etiam  
 ‘ negant, secundum Adam carnaliter natos, conta-  
 ‘ gium mortis antiquæ prima nativitate contrahere.  
 ‘ Sic enim eos sine ullo peccati originalis vinculo as-  
 ‘ serunt nasci, ut prorsus non sit quod eis oporteat  
 ‘ secunda nativitate dimitti: sed eos propterea bap-  
 ‘ tizari, ut regeneratione adoptati admittantur ad  
 ‘ regnum Dei, &c.’

‘ They do also deny that infants which are de-  
 ‘ scended from Adam according to the flesh, do, by  
 ‘ their first birth, contract any contagion of the an-  
 ‘ ciently threatened death, (for they affirm them to  
 ‘ be born without any bond of original sin;) so that  
 ‘ there is nothing in them that needs to be forgiven  
 ‘ by the second birth; but that they are baptized

<sup>i</sup> Lib. de Hæresibus, cap. 87. [Op. tom. viii. p. 20.]

‘ for that reason, that being by this regeneration CHAP. XXI.  
 ‘ adopted, they may be admitted to God’s kingdom ;  
 ‘ being by this renewal advanced from a good state 265—350.  
 (A. D.)  
 ‘ to a better, but not absolved from any ill state of 365—450.  
 ‘ the old obligation. For, though they be not bap-  
 ‘ tized, these men do promise them a certain eternal  
 ‘ and happy life ; not in the kingdom of God indeed,  
 ‘ but of a peculiar sort.’

This was the only sect that he knew of, he says<sup>k</sup>, that denied infant-baptism to be for original sin. And for any that denied it absolutely, he knew of none at all.

Mr. Tombes, being to answer Mr. Marshall<sup>l</sup>, who had produced a great many of the Fathers that speak of infants as baptized, makes this exception ; that there are several others of them that have nothing at all of that matter. ‘ It is wonder to me,’ says he<sup>m</sup>, ‘ that if it were so manifest as you speak, ‘ you should find nothing in Eusebius for it, nor in ‘ Ignatius, nor in Clemens Alexandrinus, nor in ‘ Athanasius, nor in Epiphanius.’

The objection is but weak. For there is no age of the church in which one may not find many books that say nothing of that matter ; because they treat of subjects on which they have no occasion to speak of that. Ignatius wrote nothing but a few letters to the neighbouring churches, to exhort them to constancy in that time of persecution. Athanasius was wholly taken up about the Trinity.

<sup>k</sup> See chap. xix. §. 17.

<sup>l</sup> [See Stephen Marshall’s Sermon on Infant-Baptism, 4<sup>o</sup>. 1644 : and his Defence of Infant-Baptism in answer to Mr. Tombes, 4<sup>o</sup>. 1648.]

<sup>m</sup> Examen, p. 9. 4<sup>o</sup>. 1645.



CHAP. Clemens Alexandrinus with the heathen philosophers ;  
 XXI. (yet in him we have now found a place where he in  
<sup>200.</sup>  
 (A.D. 300.) a transient and cursory way mentions the apostles  
 baptizing infants.) Eusebius writes the chronicles  
 of the succession of kings, emperors, bishops, and  
 the state of the church, either flourishing or perse-  
 cuted, under each of them.

But I think Mr. Tombes could not well have said  
 a more unlucky thing for his own cause, than to in-  
 stance in Epiphanius. For since he wrote nothing  
 to speak of, but a catalogue of those opinions which  
 the several sectaries held contrary to the church ; to  
 plead that he says nothing of infants' baptism, is in  
 effect to give an argument that there never was any  
 sect that in that matter practised otherwise than the  
 church did in Epiphanius' time, who died after the  
<sup>300.</sup> year 400. And that the church at that time used  
 infant-baptism is so plain, that the antipædobaptists  
 do seldom deny it.

V. But Mr. Tombes gives an instance of a case in  
 which he thinks it would have been proper for  
 Epiphanius to have mentioned infant-baptism, if it  
 had then been in universal use in the church. For  
 Epiphanius gives an account<sup>n</sup> of a sect, that had  
 begun about 100 years before, called the Hieracites ;  
 who taught that no infant dying before the use of  
 reason could come to the kingdom of heaven. Their  
 reason was, *If any one strive, he is not crowned,*  
*except he strive lawfully*<sup>o</sup>. 'How much less can an  
 'infant be crowned, who never strives at all ?'  
 They thought of the kingdom of God in heaven, as  
 the antipædobaptists do of his kingdom on earth,

<sup>n</sup> Hæres. 67. [cap. 2.—Op. tom. i. p. 711.]

<sup>o</sup> 2 Tim. ii. 5.

that it is no state for babes. Now Mr. Tombes thinks that Epiphanius, among the arguments he brings that infants may be glorified, would have pleaded their baptism, if the baptizing them had been usual in the church.

CHAP.  
XXI.

200.  
(A.D. 300.)

But he seems not to have considered, that heretics and schismatics do not use to be prevailed on by arguments drawn from the practice or doctrines of the church. And as for arguments from scripture, Epiphanius uses those that do more expressly and immediately prove their admission into the kingdom of God; as that saying of our Saviour, *Of such is the kingdom of God*, &c., and is but short in all.

It might be objected again, that in all probability these heretics did not baptize their own children. If they did, it could be only in prospect of some benefit it might do them afterward, if they lived. And if they did not baptize them; it had been proper for Epiphanius to mention that, as a thing wherein they differed from the catholics, supposing that the catholics did baptize theirs.

But upon a more careful reading of their opinions there rehearsed, it appears that they could have no children. For one of their tenets was, that all marriage and getting of children is unlawful under the New Testament; and that ‘no married person can inherit the kingdom of God. That the only end of Christ’s coming was to settle an absolute continence. For what new thing did he bring into the world else? Against malice, covetousness, injustice, fornication, &c., the law had well enough provided before.’

Whether these men would have baptized their children if they had had any, is uncertain. But the

CHAP. first body of men we read of, that did deny baptism  
 XXI.  
 ————— to infants, which were the Petrobrusians, anno  
 (A.D.<sup>200.</sup>300.) Dom. 1150, did it upon a ground or reason which  
<sup>1050.</sup> they held common with these men, viz. that infants  
 baptized or not baptized, are incapable of the king-  
 dom of heaven; as I shew in the Second Part of this  
 work, chap. vii. §. 5.

<sup>274.</sup> Epiphanius reckons in all eighty heresies, which  
 he says<sup>p</sup>, ‘were all that he heard of in the world.’  
 He says nothing of their baptizing or not baptizing  
 infants. But in the end of his work he recites the  
 faith held by the church, in opposition to all he-  
 resies. In settling the articles of faith he is large;  
 but he has also a few words concerning the rites of  
 the church. He mentions the fasts and feasts, &c.  
 and he adds, ‘as for the other ordinances concerning  
 ‘baptism and the internal mysteries; as the tradi-  
 ‘tion of the gospel and of the apostles is, so they are  
 ‘ordered.’ And after some mention of the manner  
 how the catholic church uses the prayers, psalms,  
 ways of relieving the poor, &c.; he adds, ‘and for  
 ‘baptism, she [the catholic church] accounts it to  
 ‘be in Christ [or to the Christians] instead of the  
 ‘old circumcision<sup>q</sup>.’ The like he says in his eighth  
 chapter, which is of the Epicureans; ‘the law had  
 ‘the patterns of things in it; but the truth of them  
 ‘is in the gospel. The law had the circumcision in  
 ‘the flesh, serving for a time, till the great circum-  
 ‘cision came, that is, baptism; which circumcises us  
 ‘from our sins, and seals us unto the name of God<sup>r</sup>.’

<sup>p</sup> Hær. 80. [cap. 10. tom. i. p. 1076.]

<sup>q</sup> [See Epiphaniï Expositio Fidei Catholicæ, cap. 22, et 24.—  
 Op. tom. i. p. 1106, 1107.]

<sup>r</sup> [Lib. i. cap. 8. §. 6.—Op. tom. i. p. 19.]



Philastrius makes above 100 heresies. He makes a difference in opinion about any trifling matter to be a heresy. He mentions no dispute about infant-baptism.

CHAP.  
XXI.  

---

200.  
(A.D. 300.)  
280.

Theodoret has wrote in the best method about 330. heresies<sup>s</sup>. He has reduced them to some general heads. He makes four. The first, of those before-mentioned and such others as have denied that the world was made by God. The second, of those that have attributed to our Saviour no other nature than the human. The other two, of other sects. He says the first sort had at that time hardly any that adhered to them: and the second sort, none at all. He mentions some sects that used no baptism at all. But it was only some of the most absurd and impious. But of those that used baptism, he has none that renounced infant-baptism. After the four books of these four sorts of heresies, he adds a fifth; which is, ‘Of the True and Orthodox Doctrines and ‘Usages of the Church.’ He mentions there the baptism of infants, not as a thing disputed of, or denied by any sect: but occasionally. Shewing the advantages of baptism, that it conveys not only pardon for the sins of men’s former life, but many other graces; he proves it by the baptism of infants, who have committed no sin. The words I had occasion to recite before<sup>t</sup>. There is another catalogue of heresies at the end of *Tertullian de Præscriptione*. But it hath nothing about baptism;

<sup>s</sup> [See his *Hæreticarum Fabularum Compendium*, (introduction,) in vol. iv. p. 187. of his works, published by Sirmondus, fol. 1642.)

<sup>t</sup> Ch. xiv. §. 4.

CHAP. save that Menander said, none could be saved, that  
XXI. were not baptized in his name.

200.  
(A.D. 300.)

---

CHAP. XXII.

*Containing References to the Books of some Authors of  
the next succeeding Times.*

300—400. §. I. THIS is the best account I can give of the  
(A. D. passages concerning infant-baptism that are in the  
400—500.) genuine books of the writers that flourished from  
the apostles' time to the year of Christ 400. The  
reason that I go no further is, because for the next  
700 years the matter is clear. Yet of those years  
and of the Waldenses that arose about the year  
1050. 1150, I intend to discourse something in general,  
in the Second Part of this work<sup>a</sup>.

And here, for the sake of those that have any  
mind to trace the quotations for about one hundred  
years further, I have set down some references to the  
places where they are to be found. To set down  
344. the words is too long; they being all to the same  
effect with those already rehearsed.

Prosper<sup>b</sup>, in almost all his works against the Pela-  
gian and Semi-pelagian tenets, makes use of the ar-  
gument taken from the necessity of the baptizing  
of infants. Particularly,

*Epist. ad Augustinum*, prefixed to St. Austin's  
book *de Prædestinatione Sanctorum*. [Op. tom. x.]

<sup>a</sup> Part ii. ch. 7.

<sup>b</sup> [See *Prosperi Opera*, ab Olivario edita, fol. Paris, 1671.  
Some of these pieces are printed in the Appendix to vol. x. of  
the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works. Also in Cassiani  
*Opera*, fol. 1628. p. 887, &c.]

*Epist. ad Demetriadem*, among the works of CHAP.  
XXII.  
St. Ambrose.

*De Vocatione Gentium*, lib. i. c. 16, 22. lib. ii. 300—400.  
(A.D.  
400—500.)  
c. 20, 21, 22, 23, &c. I know it is questioned whether this be Prosper's, or pope Leo's, or some other man's work; but it is much one to this purpose, since whoever he were, he lived about this time.

*Carmen de Ingratis*, cap. 1, 6, 21, 30, 31, &c.

*Contra Collatorem*.

*Epist. ad Rufinum*, *circa medium*.

*Defensio Augustini*.

Orosius *Apologetic*. 316<sup>e</sup>.

Paulinus Diaconus, *Libello ad Zosimum Papam*. 320<sup>d</sup>.

Hilarius Arelatensis, *Epist. ad Augustinum*. 330<sup>e</sup>.

Marius Mercator, *Commonitorii*, cap. 1, & 4. 318<sup>f</sup>.

*Præfatione ad Subnotationes*.

*Subnotat.* cap. 6. item 8.

Cælestinus Papa, *Epist. ad Maximian.* apud *Acta Concilii Ephesini*. 323<sup>g</sup>.

*Epist. ad Gallos Episcopos*.

*Epistola Synodica Concilii Ephesini ad Cælestinum Papam*. 331<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>c</sup> [Pauli Orosii adversus Paganos Historiæ, ut et Apologeticus contra Pelagium de Arbitrii Libertate,—cura S. Haverkampii, 4to. Lugd. Bat. 1738. It is reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, by Gallandi, tom. ix.]

<sup>d</sup> [See this in the Collection of Councils; edit. Labbe, vol. ii. p. 1578. edit. Mansi, tom. iv. p. 381.]

<sup>e</sup> [See these among St. Austin's epistles, No. 156, and 226, tom. ii. p. 414, and 626.]

<sup>f</sup> [M. Mercatoris opera, cura Garnerii, 2 tom. fol. Paris. 1673. cura Baluzii, 8vo. Paris, 1684: and in the Bibliotheca Patrum by Gallandi, tom. viii.]

<sup>g</sup> [See these, in the Collection of Councils, edit. Labbe, vol. ii. p. 1618, 1630: edit. Mansi, vol. iv. p. 464. vol. v. p. 271.]

<sup>h</sup> [See Councils; edit. Labbe, vol. v. p. 660. edit. Mansi, iv. p. 1329.]



- 335<sup>i</sup>. Auctor Prædestinati, a Sirmondo editus, Paris. 1643.  
 330<sup>k</sup>. Possidius in vita Augustini.  
 330<sup>l</sup>. Auctor Hypognosticōv, inter opera Augustini, lib. iv. v. et passim.  
 312<sup>m</sup>. Isidorus Pelusiota, lib. i. epist. 125. lib. iii. epist. 195, &c.  
 324<sup>n</sup>. Cassianus, de Incarnatione Domini, lib. v. c. 11.  
 312<sup>o</sup>. Cyrillus in Levitic. c. 8.  
 323<sup>p</sup>. Theodoretus in 1 Cor. vii. 14.  
     Epitome Decret. Divin. lib. v.  
 340<sup>q</sup>. Leo magnus Papa, Epist. 37. ad Neonam.  
     Epist. 92, ad Rusticum, cap. 16.  
     Epist. 86, ad Nicetam Aquilejensem. Item Epist. 88, ad Episcopus Germ.

All these were contemporary with St. Austin, but younger than he, and wrote before the year 450. And in the next fifty or sixty years, these following :

<sup>i</sup> [And reprinted in the first volume of Sirmondus' Works, fol. Paris, 1696. p. 449. Also in the Bibliotheca Patrum, by Gallandi, tom. x.]

<sup>k</sup> [This is printed in the Appendix to the 10th volume of St. Austin's works, Benedictine edition, p. 164.]

<sup>l</sup> [In the Appendix to vol. x. of the Benedictine edition, p. 3.]

<sup>m</sup> [Published at Heidelberg in 4to. 1605; by Schottus in 1623, 1629, and at Paris in 1638. They are also printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. vii. Lyons edition.]

<sup>n</sup> [See Jo. Cassiani opera, cura A. Gazæi, fol. Atrebat, 1628. p. 1036.]

<sup>o</sup> [See Cyrilli Alexandrini Opera, cura I. Auberti, fol. Lutetiae, 1638. tom. i. p. 343.]

<sup>p</sup> [These are found in volumes 3 and 4 of the works of Theodoret, published by Sirmondus, fol. Paris, 1642.]

<sup>q</sup> [The epistles of Leo were published in 1591, 1671, and 1675, 2 tom. 4to. This last is the most full and correct edition. The epistles named in the text, bear in this the numbers 135, 2, 6; and the last of them, as being considered spurious, is placed in vol. ii. p. 632. They are also printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. vii. and in the Councils; by Labbe, vol. iii. by Mansi, vols. v. and vi.]

Faustus Rhegiensis, one of those then called Semi-pelagians, de libero Arbitrio, lib. i. c. 1, 2, 14.

Gennadius, One of the same, de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus, c. 52.

And his interpolator, a Prædestinarian, c. 31.

Fulgentius, a Prædestinarian, de Veritate Prædestinationis, lib. i. *per totum*.

De Incarnatione et Gratia Jesu Christi, c. 15, item 30.

De Fide ad Petrum, c. 27, 30, &c.

De Remissione Peccatorum, lib. i. c. 14.

Epistola Synodica Episcoporum in Sardinia exulum; Bibl. Patr. Colon. 1618. tom. vi. De Prædestinatione et Gratia, c. 3.<sup>u</sup>

Joannes Maxentius, Catholica de Christo Professio, *prope finem*. Bibl. Patr. tom. vi.

The council of Gerunda, Can. 5. 417<sup>y</sup>.

The council of Ilerda, Can. 13. 424<sup>z</sup>.

Ferrandus, (a deacon of Carthage) his letter to Fulgentius about the baptism of a certain negro. 423<sup>a</sup>.

Fulgentius' Answer. 423<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>r</sup> [This work of Faustus is published in the Bibliotheca Patrum, Lyons edition, vol. viii. p. 525.]

<sup>s</sup> [See the edition of Hamburg, 4to. 1614.]

<sup>t</sup> [See Fulgentii Opera, cura G. Desprez, 4to. Paris, 1684.—Also the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. ix. Lyons edition; and tom. xi. edit. Gallandi.]

<sup>u</sup> [See also the Collection of Councils; by Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1593; by Mansi, tom. viii. p. 592.]

<sup>x</sup> [See the Bibliotheca Patrum, tom. ix. p. 534, edit. Lyons.]

<sup>y</sup> [See the Councils; Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1568; Mansi, tom. viii. p. 549.]

<sup>z</sup> [See the Councils; Labbe, tom. iv. p. 1613; Mansi, tom. viii. p. 612.]

<sup>a</sup> [See Fulgentii Ferrandi opera, cura Chifletii, 4to. Divione, 1649.—p. 55. Also the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. ix. Lyons edition; vol. xi. edit. Gallandi.]

<sup>b</sup> [See F. Ferrandi Opera, p. 58. and the Bibliotheca Patrum, as above.]

CHAP.  
XXII.<sup>423.</sup>  
(A.D. 523.)

The substance of this last mentioned letter, and the answer to it, is this: a gentleman of Carthage had bought a negro slave, that had been brought out of the inmost and savage part of Africa, where Christianity was not then, nor is yet known. His master had caused him to be instructed in the faith: he was a catechumen for some time, and at last was admitted among the competents for baptism. He had rehearsed in the congregation the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, &c., and had made the usual renunciations of the Devil, &c., as the custom of that church was for the competents to do some days before their baptism; and at the time of baptism they used to do it by way of answer, again. But just before the time in which he was to be baptized, he fell sick of so sudden and violent a fever, that at the time of baptism he was speechless, and without sense. They baptized him however; 'And we,' says Ferrandus, 'answered in his name, as if it had been for an infant. And he dying presently after, never understood, I believe, that he was baptized. Now I entreat your opinion, whether his want of speech will be no hinderance to his obtaining eternal salvation. For I am much afraid lest our Lord, to whom all things are possible, did therefore deny him the faculty of speech, because he thought him unworthy of the benefit of the second birth. For how that age of his that was capable of reason, could be cleansed by another's confession, I do not see. For it is infants only, who have no sin but original sin, whom we believe to be saved by the faith of those that bring them, &c. And if it be said, that the confession he made before, when he was well in his senses, will avail for his forgive-



‘ness ; I do not see how we can stand to that ; for  
 ‘then another will conclude, that he would have  
 ‘been saved if he had had no bodily baptism at all.  
 ‘And at that rate, why might we not baptize peo-  
 ‘ple after they are dead, if they be such whose  
 ‘devout and faithful purpose was known before ? I  
 ‘know the ordinary canon<sup>c</sup> prescribes that sick per-  
 ‘sons, that are not able to make the answers, may  
 ‘be baptized ; provided their friends will at their  
 ‘own peril testify that they had such a purpose  
 ‘before their sickness. This indeed justifies the  
 ‘minister in giving the baptism : but I make some  
 ‘question concerning the benefit that such a person  
 ‘receives by it.’

CHAP.  
XXII.  
423.  
(A.D. 523.)

The answer which the bishop Fulgentius gives to this scruple, tends all toward the comforting Ferrandus concerning his doubt of the man’s salvation. He argues that all the condition required by our Saviour for adult persons being, that they should *believe and be baptized* ; this man had both. That faith and the profession of it are the act of the man : the baptizing him is the act of the minister. And though this man had not his senses when the minister performed his act ; yet he had when he himself performed his own. That God’s taking away his senses was not so great a sign of his rejecting him, as the continuance of his life till he could be baptized, was of his receiving him. ‘It is true,’ says he, ‘that we believe none but infants are saved by the faith of those that bring them, &c. ; and that in the age of reason one’s own confession is required, &c. But this man had his

<sup>c</sup> Concilii Carthag. tertii Can. 34.

CHAP. 'senses when he professed, and he had yet life when  
XXII. 'he was baptized.'

<sup>423.</sup>  
(A.D. 523.) He grants in the following discourse, that if he had died before he had been actually baptized, he could not have been saved: which is very hard, and contrary to the determination of St. Ambrose and other Fathers in a like case, as I shew in my Second Part<sup>d</sup>.

The reason why I recite this at large, rather than the other passages to which I have given references, is not that it speaks more plainly than the rest about infant-baptism: on the contrary, the rest speak more directly to that matter than this does. But I recite it, that the earnest concern that this master and minister and bishop do shew for the salvation of this poor slave, may fly in the face, and strike with shame and terror the consciences of such profane traders of our nation, as having plantations in the West Indies, do keep hundreds of such negroes, and are so far from any concern for their souls, that on the contrary they do all they can to hinder them from Christian faith and baptism, and discourage those that would procure them means of it.

I do not conceive that all the masters there are of this temper. But for those that are, and are resolved to continue so; as I doubt they have but little belief of the truth of the scripture; so it were for their interest that it were not true. For there is nothing plainer by the tenor of it, than that such masters are in God's sense a much worse sort of heathens than their slaves, and liable to a far greater condemnation; and that beside their own

<sup>d</sup> Ch. iii. §. 3. Item ch. vi. §. 3.

personal sins, the blood of those poor creatures will be required at their hands. I would crave leave to recommend to these gentlemen the reading of a little book, published about twenty years ago, by a clergyman<sup>e</sup> that had lived in Barbadoes, called ‘The Negro’s and Indian’s Advocate.’

CHAP.  
XXII.

<sup>123.</sup>  
(A.D. 523.)

That I may tell the reader in short the substance of the places to which I have referred him; they do all speak of infant-baptism, as of a thing taken for granted. And those of them that do at all enlarge on the matter, do speak of it as absolutely necessary to the infant’s obtaining the kingdom of heaven. And this, whether they be of the Prædestinarian or Semi-pelagian opinion. And I am confident there is no passage in any author from this time to the year of Christ 1150, or thereabouts, that speaks against it; save that Walafridus Strabo, about the year 850 (though he were for infants’ baptism, and thought it necessary for their salvation, yet) gave his singular opinion, that it had not been practised from the beginning, but had come into use first in St. Austin’s time; which how palpable a mistake it was, I suppose every reader is by this time satisfied. I give you his words hereafter<sup>f</sup>. And save that Mr. Stennet produces one Macaire, an unknown author, living in the ignorant times,

<sup>e</sup> [Viz. the Rev. Morgan Godwyn, student of Christ Church, Oxford; who ‘became minister in Virginia, and continued there ‘many years,’ says Antony à Wood. He published ‘The Negro’s or Indian’s Advocate, suing for their admission into the Church; or a persuasive to the instructing and baptizing of ‘the Negroes and Indians in our plantations.’ 8vo. London, 1680: and in the next year, ‘A supplement to the Negro’s and ‘Indian’s Advocate,’ in one sheet and a half, quarto.]

<sup>f</sup> Part ii. ch. 2. §. 2.



CHAP. who talks much as Strabo does. Of whom I must  
 XXII. also speak hereafter, part ii. ch. 2.

<sup>423.</sup>  
 (A.D. 523.)

### CHAP. XXIII.

*Quotations out of some books that are spurious, i. e. were not written by those whose name they bear; but yet are proved to be ancient.*

<sup>300.</sup>  
 (A.D. 400.) §. 1. LET the first of these be that out of the book called 'Clement's Constitutions.' They are called his, because he is feigned to have been the compiler of them from the mouths of the apostles. The history of which book, as near as learned men have traced it, is this.

There were in the very early times certain traditionary accounts handed about as the preachings, doctrines, or rules that had been delivered by such or such an apostle or apostolical man; something like the shorthand notes of sermons, which it was the late custom in England to take from the mouths of celebrated preachers. One of which would be called, for example, *Διδαχὴ Πέτρου* 'the doctrine of Peter:' another, *Διδασκαλία Κλήμεντος*, 'the preaching of Clement,' &c. And several of these being by some studious persons collected and put together, were entitled *Διατάξεις Ἀποστόλων*, 'the Rules, or Constitutions of the Apostles<sup>a</sup>.'

<sup>a</sup> The Constitutions of the Apostles appear to have been first published in Greek in the year 1540: Cotelierius edited them in Greek and Latin, with learned notes and dissertations, among his *Patres Apostolici*, 2 tom. fol. 1700, reprinted 1724. The Greek text, accompanied by an English version and a dissertation, was given by Whiston, in his 'Primitive Christianity revived,' vols. 2 and 3, 8vo. 1711.—And the text is printed by Gallandi, in his edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. iii.]

If they had been all of them judicious and sincere persons that first took these notes of the preachings or sayings of the apostles; and they that collected them into volumes had been the like; there is no doubt but the collections would have been highly valuable. And as they are, they do for the most part consist of pious rules and exhortations. But according to the various memories, or judgment, or honesty of the first recorders, or after-compilers, these compositions were in many things various, uncertain, and by men of different inclinations differently interpolated, and so of no authority.

CHAP.  
XXIII.  

---

300.  
(A.D. 400.)

In Eusebius' time, anno 320, there was a volume of this nature, called *Διδαχαὶ Ἀποστόλων*, 'Doctrines of the Apostles;' which he reckons<sup>a</sup> among the spurious books. Epiphanius<sup>b</sup> fifty years after cites a book called 'Constitutions of the Apostles;' which he says was of doubtful credit; and it has also been altered since his time. About the year 400 it seems to have been licked and brought into that form of eight books, in which we now have it, and to have been set forth with that confident title, as if the whole had been put into form by St. Clement. This is confirmed by the quotations<sup>c</sup> of it by the Author of the 'Opus imperfectum in Matthæum,' who lived about that time.

220.  
270.  
300.

<sup>a</sup> Hist. Eccl. lib. iii. cap. 25.

<sup>b</sup> [Hæres. xlv. sect. 5: item Hæres. lxx. sect. 10—12. Hæres. lxxv. sect. 6. lxxx. sect. 7.]

<sup>c</sup> [See these given by Cotelierius, at tom. i. p. 191 of his edition of the *Patres Apostolici*; also by Gallandi, at p. 5 of his prefatory matter to the Constitutions, Bibl. Patrum, tom. iii. The work itself is found among the spurious pieces ascribed to St. Chrysostom, in vol. vi. of Montfaucon's edition, p. lxxiv.]

CHAP. XXIII. Hence it appears, that for any particular clause or chapter of it, one does not know how long, or how little while before the year 400 it has been inserted. The clause to the present purpose is this,  
 Constitut. Apostolic. lib. vi. cap. 15.

The apostles are there brought in speaking. And after they have disallowed of such as baptize twice; and also set forth the wickedness of those that despise all baptism, they say:

‘And he that says, “I will be baptized when I am going to die, that I may not sin after it, and defile my baptism;” such a man has no true knowledge of God, and is ignorant of his nature. For, *Delay not thou to turn to the Lord; for thou knowest not what to-morrow will bring forth.*’

And then they add,

Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ Θεοῦ. Ἄφετε γὰρ, φησὶ, τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς με, καὶ μὴ κωλύετε αὐτά.

‘And baptize your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God. For he says, *Suffer the little children to come to me, and forbid them not.*’

How little assurance soever there is, from the credit of this book, that these are the apostle’s words; yet they shew that it was the received doctrine at the time when they were put into the book.

II. The quotation of the book of ‘The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy<sup>d</sup>’ is commonly thought worth the while by those that write on this subject.

<sup>d</sup> [See Dionysii Areopagitæ Opera, studio B. Corderii, 2 tom. fol. Lutetiæ, 1644.]



Otherwise I for my part should hardly think it worth the setting down. CHAP.  
XXIII.

Partly, because of the abhorrence one should have of so gross and impudent a forger; who having, about the year 400, if not later, composed some <sup>300.</sup> (A.D. 400.) books remarkable for nothing but affected high-flown expressions, thought them fit to be fathered upon Dionysius the Areopagite, mentioned Acts xvii. 34. Unless we are to think that the author himself was not guilty of this imposture; but that somebody else having got the copies of these books into his hands, did thrust in here and there a sentence which should represent that Dionysius as the author. Which I have sometimes thought.

And partly, because what he says on this subject seems to me spoken with less judgment than usual; towering in words, but shallow in sense.

I shall forbear setting down the original, (for it is not worth reciting twice,) only give the translation of his bombast Greek in as plain English as I can.

He in this treatise gives an account of the several rites used at the eucharist, at ordinations, &c., and among the rest, at baptism, (which he generally calls by the name of the *divine birth*,) and of the reasons of them. What he has of baptism does mostly concern the baptism of the adult, and their professions. What he says of the baptism of infants, is in answer to the objections the heathens made against it, and is as follows:

Ecclesiastic. Hierarch. cap. 7. *in fine*. [sect. 11.  
tom. i. p. 360.]

‘ But that children also, who cannot yet under-

CHAP.  
XXIII.(A.D.<sup>300.</sup>  
400.)

‘ stand the divine mysteries, should be made par-  
 ‘ takers of the divine birth, and of the most sacred  
 ‘ signs of society with God, does seem, as you say,  
 ‘ to men that are profane and ill-affected to our  
 ‘ religion, a thing fit to be laughed at: that the  
 ‘ bishops should teach the holy things to those that  
 ‘ are incapable of them, and should bestow the  
 ‘ things which by sacred tradition they have re-  
 ‘ ceived, upon such as have no sense of them. And,  
 ‘ what is more ridiculous, that others should pro-  
 ‘ nounce the renunciations and holy professions for  
 ‘ them in such a fashion as if they were doing it for  
 ‘ themselves.

‘ Now your episcopal wisdom ought not to be  
 ‘ angry with those that are in error; but to answer  
 ‘ their objections with a religious meekness, for  
 ‘ their instruction and edification: adding this also  
 ‘ as from our holy religion; that our knowledge is  
 ‘ not able to comprehend all divine things: and that  
 ‘ a great many things which we cannot understand,  
 ‘ have really reasons that are worthy of God, un-  
 ‘ known to us, but known to the higher beings:  
 ‘ and even those higher natures are ignorant of  
 ‘ many things which are known only to the all-wise  
 ‘ Deity, the author of all wisdom.

‘ And yet, as to this particular matter, that we  
 ‘ do say the same things which our divine ministers  
 ‘ of holy things have delivered down to us as they  
 ‘ were taught them from ancient tradition. For  
 ‘ they say, and it is true, that children, if they be  
 ‘ brought up to holy rules and institutions, will  
 ‘ come to be of a good temper of mind; free, and  
 ‘ disentangled from all error, and out of the danger  
 ‘ of an unclean life. Our divine instructors consi-

‘dering this, have thought fit that children should  
‘be admitted after this holy manner :

CHAP.  
XXIII.

‘That the natural parents of the child which is  
‘brought, should deliver him to some one that is  
‘himself baptized, as to a good instructor in the  
‘things of God: and that the child should after-  
‘ward learn of him, as of his father in God, and  
‘his sponsor in things that are for salvation. And  
‘then of this person, who undertakes to instruct  
‘the child in holiness of life, the bishop does de-  
‘mand, as I may call it, the declaration of his re-  
‘nouncings, and the other holy professions. Not  
‘that he does (as they jeeringly represent it) initiate  
‘the one in the other’s stead in the holy rites :  
‘for he does not say thus; “ I do in the stead of  
‘this child renounce or promise,” &c.; but, “ This  
‘child does renounce, profess,” &c.; that is, I pro-  
‘mise to persuade this child, when he shall come of  
‘age to understand the holy things, by my religious  
‘instructions, to renounce the adverse powers, and  
‘keep clear from them, and to profess and fulfil the  
‘divine proposals.’

‘It is therefore, as far as I can see, no absurdity  
‘that the child should be entered into the divine  
‘life; whenas he has a guide and sponsor that will  
‘instruct him in the knowledge of divine things,  
‘and keep him safe from the adverse powers. And  
‘the bishop does make the child partaker of the  
‘holy mysteries, that he may be educated according  
‘to them, and may lead no other life but such as  
‘has always a regard to those divine things, and an  
‘agreement with them, and is in a holy manner  
‘habituated to them. And to this he is led by his  
‘divine sponsor.’



CHAP. XXIII.  
 (A.D. 400.) His mentioning *ancient tradition* in this matter, would make one think what I hinted before, that the author had no purpose of putting on the vizor of Dionysius the Areopagite: for to make him talk of ancient tradition in any thing of Christianity, which was all new in his time, was to betray his own cheat. Beside, it is not in this book of the 'Ecclesiastical Hierarchy,' that there are any tokens of its being written by Dionysius, but only in some of the other books of the same author.

The interpretation he gives of the professions made by the godfathers is very singular: he will not have it that the godfather does renounce, profess, &c. in the child's name or stead. But both the ancients generally, and the moderns, do so understand it as that he does. But perhaps both of these may be reconciled. The godfather does not profess in the child's stead, so as that the godfather's performance of those professions should be in stead of the child's performance of them: and in this sense this author denies it. But the godfather does profess in the child's stead, so as to declare the obligation of the child to perform, and does in his name own that obligation, and make the promise: and in this sense the other ancients affirm it. To the intent it may more fully be declared that the benefits of baptism are conveyed to the child not absolutely, but on condition that if he live, he do perform his part of the covenant; the godfather expresses those things that are the child's part. As if a great benefactor will settle a large estate of inheritance on a child, upon condition that he pay a small quitrent in acknowledgment; this is so beneficial to the child, that there ought to be no doubt of his

acceptance. The contract is therefore made in the child's name: and because he is not of age, his guardian seals it in his stead. This the church of England does more plainly express; who puts the words thus, 'Dost thou in the name of this child renounce?' &c. And so did the ancients, who put them thus, 'Does this child renounce?' &c.

CHAP.  
XXIII.  
<sup>300.</sup>  
(A.D. 400.)

As for the age in which these books were written, it is best gathered from Photius<sup>e</sup>: who gives the abstract of a book written by Theodorus Presbyter, wherein he pretended to maintain that these books are the genuine work of Dionysius the Areopagite, against some that then opposed the authenticallness of them. The man must have had a hard task. But yet it is a proof that they were known then, and for some time before. This Theodorus lived, as Dr. Hammond says<sup>f</sup>, anno 420; but others place him much later, in the seventh century.

III. There does not lie any such prejudice for any design of forgery against the author of the 'Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos', which commonly go among the works of Justin Martyr: only that piece going about, as it seems, without the name of the author, somebody in the early times ascribed it to him. It cannot be his, because it makes mention of Irenæus and of Origen, who lived something after

<sup>e</sup> [See Photii Bibliotheca, p. 3, 4. edit. Hæschelii, fol. Rothomagi, 1653. Photius however gives no 'abstract,' beyond one single sentence, 'Ανεγνώσθη Θεοδώρου πρεσβυτέρου, ὅτι γνησία ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου βίβλος.]

<sup>f</sup> Six Queries. Infant Baptism. [The editor of Photius observes, and as was natural to him, laments, that this work of Theodorus is not now extant.]

<sup>g</sup> [See Justini Martyris opera, edit. Benedictin. fol. Paris. 1742. p. 462.]

CHAP. his time; unless those passages that mention Ire-  
 XXIII. næus and Origen have been since the first writing  
 (A.D.<sup>300.</sup><sub>400.</sub>) of the book foisted into it. I shall not pretend to  
 guess at the time of the writing of it; only it is  
 known to be ancient. The passage I would quote  
 is this,

Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos, quæst. 56.

Ἑρώτησις.

Εἰ τὰ τελευτῶντα βρέφη ἔπαινον ἢ μέμψιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἐξ ἔργων, τίς ἡ διαφορὰ ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῶν ὑπὸ ἄλλων μὲν βαπτισθέντων καὶ μηδὲν πραξάντων, καὶ τῶν μὴ βαπτισθέντων καὶ ὁμοίως μηδὲν πραξάντων;

Ἀπόκρισις.

Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ διαφορὰ τῶν βαπτισθέντων πρὸς τὰ μὴ βαπτισθέντα, τοῦ τυχεῖν μὲν τὰ βαπτισθέντα τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν, τὰ δὲ μὴ βαπτισθέντα μὴ τυχεῖν. Ἀξιοῦνται δὲ τῶν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν, τῇ πίστει τῶν προσφερόντων αὐτὰ τῷ βαπτίσματι.

Question.

‘ Since children that die in infancy have no praise  
 ‘ nor no blame from any thing that they have done,  
 ‘ what difference will be made at the resurrection  
 ‘ between such of them as have been by the means  
 ‘ of others baptized but have done nothing them-  
 ‘ selves, and such as have not been baptized and  
 ‘ have likewise done nothing?’

Answer.

‘ This will be the difference between those that  
 ‘ have been baptized, and those that have not: that  
 ‘ the baptized will be made partakers of the bless-  
 ‘ ings granted by baptism; and the unbaptized not.  
 ‘ And these blessings of baptism are vouchsafed to  
 ‘ them for the sake of the faith of those that bring  
 ‘ them to baptism.’



He speaks of the case of unbaptized infants after the rate that most Greek writers do, viz. that they will lose all reward, without mentioning any positive punishment. This was the general opinion of the Christians of the Greek church, that infants dying unbaptized would miss of heaven, but not be under any positive punishment: as appears by the words of Gregory Nazianzen cited before<sup>h</sup>, and as I shall more fully shew at another place<sup>i</sup>.

CHAP.  
XXIII.

(A.D. 300.  
400.)

IV. There is a spurious book ascribed to Athanasius, called *Quæstiones ad Antiochum*, which gives their opinion in this matter very particularly. Some quotations out of that book ought to have had a place here, but that it seems to have been written after our period, and by ignorant men crowded in among the works of Athanasius<sup>k</sup>. But the following passage I recite, because of its affinity to the foregoing.

*Quæst. ad Antiochum, qu. 115.*

Ἐρώτησις.

Ποῦ ὑπάγουσι τὰ τελευτῶντα [πιστὰ] νήπια; εἰς κόλασιν, ἢ εἰς βασιλείαν; καὶ ποῦ τὰ τῶν ἀπίστων νήπια; καὶ ποῦ τὰ τῶν πιστῶν ἀβάπτιστα ἀποθνήσκοντα τάττονται; μετὰ τῶν πιστῶν, ἢ ἀπίστων;

Ἀπόκρισις.

Τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος, Ἐφετε τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς μέ, τῶν γὰρ ποιούτων ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν· καὶ πάλιν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου φάσκοντος, νῦν δὲ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἁγία ἐστι· Πρόδηλον ὅτι ὡς ἄσπιλα καὶ πιστὰ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται τὰ τῶν πιστῶν βεβαπτισμένα

<sup>h</sup> Chap. xi. §. 6.

<sup>i</sup> Part ii. chap. 6. §. 4.

<sup>k</sup> [See

Athanasii opera, studio Monachorum Benedictin. 3 tom. fol. Paris. 1698. tom. ii. p. 295.]

CHAP. νήπια. Τὰ δὲ ἀβάπτιστα καὶ τὰ ἐθνικὰ οὔτε εἰς  
 XXIII. βασιλείαν εἰσέρχονται· ἀλλ' οὔτε πάλιν εἰς κόλασιν  
 (A.D.<sup>300.</sup><sub>400.</sub>) Ἀμαρτίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἔπραξαν.

## Question.

‘ Whither do [faithful] infants go when they die,  
 ‘ into punishment, or into the kingdom? And par-  
 ‘ ticularly, whither go the children of heathens?  
 ‘ And where are placed the children of the faithful  
 ‘ that die unbaptized? Are they placed with the  
 ‘ believers, or with the unbelievers?

## Answer.

‘ Insomuch as our Lord says, *Suffer little chil-*  
 ‘ *dren to come to me, for of such is the kingdom of*  
 ‘ *heaven*: and again the apostle says, *Now are*  
 ‘ *your children holy*, [or saints,] it is plain that  
 ‘ the children of believers do, if they be baptized,  
 ‘ go as spotless and faithful into the kingdom. But  
 ‘ those of them that are not baptized, do not enter  
 ‘ the kingdom, as also neither do the children of  
 ‘ unbelievers. But yet neither on the other side do  
 ‘ they go into torment; for they have committed  
 ‘ no sin.’

They that would read any more of those spurious passages that are later than the year 400, but ascribed to authors before that time, and yet are not very scandalous, as being really within a century of it, or thereabouts, in which there happens to be mention of infant-baptism, may have some of them in the said book: *Athanasii Quæstiones ad Antiochum, quæst. 2. item qu. 66.* And also, *Athanasii Dicta et interpretatio Parabolæ S. Script. quæst. 94.*

And more in books ascribed to St. Chrysostom, as Chrysostom in Psal. xiv. ‘ One brings an infant

‘to be baptized; presently the priest requires a CHAP.  
 ‘covenant,’ &c. Idem, *Homilia de Adam et Eva.* XXIII.  
 ‘Let us consider the meaning of what the church <sup>300.</sup>  
 ‘all over the world practises in the baptizing of (A.D. 400.)  
 ‘infants or adult persons,’ &c.

V. There is also commonly produced a passage very ancient indeed; if one might rely upon it: an order of Hyginus, bishop of Rome; that ‘in all <sup>22.</sup>  
 ‘baptisms there must be one [*patrinus*] godfather, ‘and one godmother.’ But as this is of no credit for authenticallness, having no voucher elder than Platina<sup>1</sup>, so also it does not necessarily relate to infants: for they had witnesses that are sometimes called *patrini*, in the case of adult persons.

This sort of testimonies is better omitted. For in any cause whatever, evidences of no good credit do more hurt than good.

<sup>1</sup> In vita Hygini. [Historia de vita et moribus summorum Pontificum. The editions of this work are numerous.]







1 1012 01184 9645

<del>OCT 9 5 2007</del>		
DEC 4 2007		
GAYLORD		PRINTED IN U.S.A.

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.







